Pacific School of Religion
Berkeley, Calif.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THERE has been published this month a book intended for ministers, more especially for ministers of the Anglican Communion, and primarily for the newly ordained. But ministers of any Communion might turn to it with profit. It is a composite work, edited by the Rev. Hubert S. Box, B.D., Ph.D., and is entitled *The Priest as Student* (S.P.C.K.; 8s. 6d. net).

Help and guidance are here given on the study of philosophy, sociology, and literature, as well as on the study of subjects coming within the ambit proper of theology: Old Testament, New Testament, The Fathers; Dogmatic Theology, Moral Theology, Spiritual Theology; Canon Law; Church History, Liturgiology. One of the most attractive and useful of the chapters is by the Rev. S. L. BROWN, D.D., who writes on the Study of the Old Testament.

Why should the 'priest,' asks this writer, devote more time to the study of the Old Testament than he is in the habit of doing? His answer is that the Old Testament is necessary to a complete understanding of the New; that it was the Bible both of Jesus Our Lord and of His apostles; that it is a storehouse of biography, anecdote, and illustration; that it shows the foundations upon which the Christian Faith is built; and that it contains a special message for us at the present day.

These points are all well made. We might notice the last point in some detail. The reason why it may be said that the Old Testament has a special message for our times is that, as the late Professor J. E. McFadyen pointed out, it belongs to a world more like our own than that of the Apostolic Age.

It is near to us in its social, economic, and political problems (as witness the Prophets); in its occasional moods of doubt and scepticism (think of Job, Ecclesiastes, and some of the Psalms); in its background of war (a thousand years' war, from Moses to the Maccabees); and in its emphasis upon nationality (though its highest teaching, as in Ruth, Jonah, and passages from Psalmist and Prophet, transcends a narrow nationalism). For example, we mistake the meaning and purpose of Ruth if we fail to recognize that it is a protest against the attempts made by Nehemiah and Ezra to enforce what Hitler and Mussolini would call racial purity.

Dr. S. L. BROWN adds another reason why we should not neglect the Old Testament: its intrinsic interest as a field of study. The new light—linguistic, internal, and external—which has been received through modern criticism and research has taught us more about the human element in the Bible, and this in its turn serves to bring home to us more clearly the reality and nature of the divine element.

First, we know more about Arabic and Aramaic

than did those who gave us our Revised Version fifty years ago; and we have to note the comparatively recent discovery and decipherment of Egyptian, Accadian, and Hittite,—all of which languages illuminate the pages of the old Testament.

Again, the new critical (literary and historical) knowledge has added enormously to the interest of the Old Testament. Passages have been restored to their original setting. Ancient difficulties have been removed. Indeed the Old Testament has been given back to us with its message made clearer.

Yet again, new light upon the Old Testament comes from the 'external' (as distinguished from the 'internal') material which modern criticism and research have supplied. This material comes from the more or less contemporary records of ancient monuments, tablets, and papyri; from the archæological evidence of excavations; from geographical research, folklore, psychology, and the comparative study of religious beliefs and customs.

But, to quote S. A. Cook, 'It is only when we seem to have deprived the Old Testament of all that was once thought to be peculiar to it that we discover how much more brightly its distinctiveness shines forth.'

There are changes of fashion in theological thought as in other things. Certain aspects of truth take possession of Christian minds, are hailed perhaps at first as a new revelation, hold the field for a time, and then, being seen to be inadequate, fall again into the background.

The present generation has witnessed notable changes of that sort. Many can recall the enthusiasm with which the Social Gospel was preached and received. Books like those of Peabody in England and Walter Rauschenbusch in America were found to be fresh and strangely fascinating. They inspired many ardent young minds with new possibilities of Christian service. They seemed to make the Kingdom of God so attractive and humanly realizable. This gave rise to a spirit of what Continental theologians called activism which was specially prevalent in America. When American and Continental churchmen met in œcumenical conference they could hardly understand each others' language regarding the Kingdom of God. The energetic Westerns spoke as if the Kingdom were almost synonymous with social reform and could be brought in by human effort much as men carry through a political programme, all of which seemed to minds trained in another school to be presumptuous and forgetful of the fact that the Kingdom is of God through the gift of His grace.

A change of fashion in theological thought came with the rise of the eschatological school, led by Albert Schweitzer. It emphasized those elements in the gospel which speak of the Kingdom as supernatural in its origin and essence, something which man cannot achieve but can only wait and pray for, because it comes only in God's good time and by the power of His grace alone. More recently the Barthian theology has set currents of thought moving in the same direction with the stress it lays upon the sovereignty of God and His impact upon the world from above.

This change in theological thought has no doubt been greatly intensified by the cruel disillusionment which has fallen upon our age. It is manifest to every thoughtful mind to-day that the confident optimism of the nineteenth century has suffered a complete eclipse. The pæans in praise of human progress are silent, the upward progress is stayed and the nations are floundering ever deeper in the bog. The optimists are forced to the admission that there is a malady in human nature deeper than they had realized, and that if human society is to be redeemed it must be by some diviner power than man's.

The situation, then, in which we find ourselves to-day calls for a restatement of the doctrine of the Kingdom of God which will do fuller justice to the many-sided teaching of the Gospels. Activism has proved to be a broken reed, for the outbreak of evil in the world has gone far beyond human

control. On the other hand, an exclusive emphasis on the eschatological point of view leads inevitably to quietism and a cessation of all real effort for social betterment. Can we find in Jesus' teaching about the Kingdom of God an evangel of hope for this tragic time in which we live? What did Jesus mean by the phrase? Is it social or individual in its implications? 'The kingdom implies a king and a reign. Does it mean God's reign in the hearts of individuals or in the institutions of society? Has it a temporal reference, or does it anticipate something beyond time? Did Jesus think it would take place in history, or only beyond history? And how is it to be ushered in—by human effort or by divine power? Is it to be an evolution or an Apocalypse?'

These are some of the issues discussed in a book published by the Cokesbury Press in their series of 'good books.' Its title is *The Evangel of a New World*, by the Rev. Dr. Albert Edward Day (Cokesbury Press; $1.50). The writer does not enter into minute details of exegesis which would require a much larger work, but he is a sound interpreter of gospel teaching, and his applications of that teaching to modern conditions are very suggestive and helpful.

Jesus clearly believed in a Kingdom of God beyond time and history. This seems 'the inevitable deduction from His own assumption of the title Son of Man, who in the apocalyptic tradition was a suprahistorical figure who came down from heaven to inaugurate a heavenly society.' He said at the Eucharist meal, 'I will not drink of the fruit of the vine till the Kingdom of God shall come,' and in that Kingdom He envisaged a condition of life in which they 'neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels in heaven.'

Moreover, Jesus believed that the Kingdom beyond time and history would come by God's power. Parable after parable makes explicit and emphatic that belief—the seed growing secretly, the marriage supper, the hid treasure, all speak of something divinely given. The comparison of the coming of the Son of Man to the lightning flashing from east to west indicates no gradual evolution of the worse into the better but a transformation so swift as to be almost instantaneous. At the same time He held that the Kingdom had already come in His own life and work. This is clearly expressed in all His teaching. And, further, this Kingdom present in His life and work was the result of God's self-manifestation through Him. It was 'with the finger of God' that He cast out devils and did His wondrous works.

'Can we bring these different strands of belief into an ordered and consistent whole? I do not think we can unless in some such fashion as this. The Kingdom of God as Jesus conceived it is a suprasensible, suprahistorical reality which invaded history in His own person, accounting for His life and death and triumph over death. But the historical order cannot contain the whole meaning of the Kingdom. Its consummation must come when God, standing athwart the years, brings time to an end, and inaugurates the—to us—unimaginable régime of eternity. The Kingdom of God is that splendour which emerged in Jesus and to which His disciples awoke after Jesus' death, when, their eyes being partly opened, they saw and knew what they had seen, but had not seen in Him and through Him, when as Jesus prophesied they drank the new wine of the Kingdom.'

What does all this mean for us and for our hopes of social betterment? Does it negate the conception of social progress and condemn all our crusades as the hot haste of little men? Or, on the other hand, does it offer us a corrective of our dreams and a discipline for our endeavours? Surely the latter if it be rightly understood.

Briefly it gives us, for one thing, 'a sound and invigorating philosophy of reality.' Where is Ultimate Reality or God? Inside or outside the time-process? If the answer be wholly outside, then all the struggle within the time-process is hopeless, for there is no power available to lift man up. Likewise if the answer be wholly inside, the struggle is equally hopeless, for God is nothing more than the process itself. But in the concept

of the Kingdom we have a transcendent God who is immanent in Jesus Christ. 'God is in the process as its sustaining, vital element. God is beyond the process as its flying goal. The God beyond the process is ever breaking into the process, lifting it to higher levels, creating new forms into which He pours new life, making it more and more a hint and revelation of what He is, and therefore more and more a source of satisfaction to us who, also within the process, have set within our hearts hungers which the process can never satisfy, but which can be appeased only by what He is.'

It gives us also the principle of right procedure. 'We cannot bring in the Kingdom of God any more than we can bring in some Utopia. We do not have to bring it in. God must and God will in His own time.' Our only hope is an infusion of the eternal, a breath from heaven, a transforming touch of the ideal. But this does not condemn us to quietism. What we *can* do, and what we have the responsibility of doing, is to let the Kingdom in its saving power have a chance at *us*. It must begin there. 'To us comes an old call with a new meaning—Repent, for the kingdom of God is at hand. Such repentance involves so drastic an overhauling of ourselves and our human relations that . . . if only they who are called Christians repented, many of the glaring wrongs of the world would be righted. The Kingdom of God cannot visit us until we repent, and repentance is a man's sized job for any man. If every Christian door-yard were clear, the debris which makes hideous and pestilential much of our communal life would already be on the way out. We are in no position to do anything about other social dirt until we get rid of our own private uncleanness.'

And when our hearts become a part of the Kingdom of God we shall see society with new eyes. In tackling the practical problems of our time we shall have a standard of judgment and procedure. It will be this—access to the Kingdom of God. 'Anything which blocks men's way to the Kingdom is under condemnation. Anything which keeps the way open is not perfect, to be sure, but may be the best that can be expected in human situations.' It is for the sons of the Kingdom wisely to apply this principle of judgment and strive to clear out of men's path everything that hinders its coming.

Those who have read that theological thriller 'Who Moved the Stone?' by Mr. Frank Morison will be eager to read his new book: *And Pilate Said* . . . It professes to be, and is, 'a new study of the Roman Procurator.' In that aspect alone it is both interesting and important, and sets the famous Roman in a more favourable light than the traditional portrait. But the book is far more than a study of Pilate. It is a re-reading of the gospel story, particularly of the story of the post-Crucifixion phenomena. And in that matter it is of special value.

To begin with, the author draws attention to a fact which has impressed him profoundly, the very curious emphasis which all the documents place upon these phenomena. It is entirely different from what you would expect. Here is a great Teacher arrested and condemned. His followers flee, reassemble later and pledge themselves to carry on the work which He had begun. The rest is history, and the ever-growing dominance of the Christian Church. Now what would you expect on these historical postulates?

You would surely expect to find this nucleus of a new and growing movement going about the world with a message which laid primary emphasis upon the *content of the Teaching*. 'Here, they would say, is a great and profoundly good man with a new and vivid gospel for the bewildered sons of men. He was wickedly cut off in the very zenith of his powers. But his message still lives, and we will devote our lives to carrying it to the ends of the world.' Actually we find nothing of the kind.

We find that the *primary* interest is not so much what Jesus *said* as *who He was*. And at the heart of all this contemporary writing is the confident assertion, as though the fact could not seriously be challenged, that God had raised this man from

the dead. Yet, about thirty years after the Crucifixion, when all the initial excitement had died down, and the earliest written records begin to appear, the teaching emerges slowly, as we know it must. It is like a submerged volcanic island rising by progressive stages from the sea. The higher peaks and the more vivid parables come out first in St. Mark. Then a vaster plateau emerges in the twin Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke, depending largely on contemporary notes and recollections of the more arresting sayings. Finally the picture is completed in St. John.

Two broad facts emerge from all this. One is that the historic figure whom we call Jesus of Nazareth was of a *stature commensurate with the dislodgement of events* produced by His history. The other is that, in all human probability, we should never have heard of this teaching of Jesus at all had it not been for the post-Crucifixion experiences. This stands out of the historic picture. Who would have troubled to report the teaching had not something far more challenging to the thought and belief of the ancient world been carried by eager and excited men to the confines of the Roman Empire? It is clear that the post-Crucifixion phenomena were the spearhead of the Christian movement in earliest times. It was this that 'saved' the teaching and secured its historical and literary permanence.

We are forced, therefore, to inquire how it was that the followers of Jesus, and the immense numbers of new converts who rallied to their cause, came to be so undeniably convinced of the survival of Jesus. Here we have three logical alternatives. The first is the hypothesis of the Twin-Brother. This is sponsored by Dr. Robert Eisler in his notable book, 'The Messiah Jesus and John the Baptist.' It was a twin-brother of Jesus that the women saw, and their fleeting glances at him started the rumour of the Resurrection. With all respect to Mr. Morison, it does not seem necessary to delay on this wild and fantastic theory.

The second hypothesis is that of hallucination. It had a considerable vogue forty years ago, but it is generally recognized to-day as failing to satisfy historical conditions. It presupposes a state of mind in the disciples favourable to the production of a phantom of their dead leader. And it breaks down completely in the face of the experience of St. Paul. Here was a man definitely *hostile* to the teaching of the Apostles. Yet it is this man, with his brilliant intellectual equipment, who came over—lock, stock and barrel—to its support. It is impossible to exaggerate the historical significance of this very remarkable fact.

We are brought, therefore, face to face with the ultimate question: What *will* satisfy all the known conditions of this complex historical problem? At this point Mr. Morison stops to define a word which unavoidably appears in this connexion, the word 'supernormal.' There is a growing body of phenomena in experience concerning which we have as yet insufficient data and upon which an ultimate judgment must of necessity be deferred. Among these the 'appearances' of Christ are a classical example. It is illogical to deny them, because, if they are totally eliminated from the historic field, the history of the first century yields only an intellectual chaos.

Even so convinced a modernist as Kirsopp Lake recognizes this. He argues that a purely subjective explanation of the appearances does not satisfy the historical conditions, and supports the theory that the phenomena had an objective stimulus, 'the manifestation of a surviving personality,' to use his own words. We do not yet know how so vivid and intense a consciousness of a visible and audible presence was produced in the minds of the recipients. We only know that the evidence for it in the Gospels is exceptionally strong, and behind that great witness is the earlier and authentic voice of Paul calling to us in that ringing passage from the first letter to the Corinthians (chapter fifteen).

Mr. Morison then goes on to emphasize the fact that *an empty tomb* was associated with the Christian story from the very first morning. All the documents agree that the women who went to the tomb

were prevented from performing the last rites. They 'found not' the body of Jesus. He stresses the point that the thought of a vacant grave was not an inference from the appearances. Its association with the story is as old as Christianity itself. And in a very convincing passage he argues that the place of interment was perfectly well known, and, since the Christians were gaining many converts by their confident assertion of the Resurrection, all the authorities needed to do was to point out the sealed tomb and show that it was intact.

And so we reach two conclusions. One is that the 'appearances' of Jesus, as described in the Gospels, seem to indicate the manifestation of psycho-physical phenomena of a very unusual kind, and must therefore be placed provisionally in the category already referred to, *i.e.* of events concerning which we have as yet insufficient scientific or experimental data. And, second, the suggestion that the Christian campaign in Jerusalem, prior to the first Persecution, was (or could have been) conducted consciously in the physical presence of the remains of Jesus, lying by the mutual consent of both sides within three minutes' walk of the Gennath Gate, raises logical stresses of a very grave order—a sort of deformation of history. Historically we can carry the investigation no further. We can only wait that fuller light which time, and our growing knowledge of this strange universe, will assuredly shed upon it.

Mr. MORISON has an unusually balanced and scientific cast of mind. His conclusions are stated with cautious reserve. Those which we have summarized are contained in a postscript to his book, written in his hotel in Jerusalem the night before he left for home. As he sat and reflected on his own investigations and on the scenes they recalled, his conviction of the reliability of the gospel story came upon him with renewed force. There are things in that story that are 'supernormal,' and so far not fully intelligible, but of the supreme fact which is central to the Christian gospel, and of the solid evidence for it, the author, on grounds which we have briefly indicated, is perfectly assured.

Recent Biblical Archaeology.

BY THE REVEREND J. W. JACK, D.D., GLENFARG, PERTHSHIRE.

THE view put forward before the 'Académie des Inscriptions' by the Abbé Hennequin, and mentioned in our June article, that there was no evidence of animal sacrifices in the temple at Lachish, but only of cereal and perfume offerings, has now been found to be incorrect. Thanks to Sir Charles Marston, quantities of bones which were found around the altar and in the rubbish pits, and which on account of their small size seem to have been regarded at the time as those of fowls, have been examined by Professor D. M. S. Watson, of the Department of Zoology in University College, London, and turn out to be mostly those of lambs (or goats) with a few of oxen and of two wild beasts (such as gazelle or ibex). He draws attention to two remarkable features. One is that the animals were all young, and the other that practically all the identifiable bones are metacarpels of the right fore-leg. There were three successive temples at Lachish, all on the same site (in the Hyksos fosse surrounding the city), the earliest dating from about 1550 B.C., and the latest being still in existence, it is known, about 1250 B.C., and the bones are stated by Mr. Charles Inge (who assisted the late Mr. J. L. Starkey) to have come from all three structures. The discovery leads to some interesting conclusions. For one thing, the offering, it should be noted, is in accordance with the ritual described in Lv 7^{32-34} and elsewhere, according to which the victims had to be young (a lamb, kid, calf, etc., 'of the first year'), and the right leg, probably the fore-leg, was dedicated to Yahweh as a 'contribution' or 'selected portion' (*terûma*, wrongly translated 'heave-offering' in many places both in A.V. and R.V.), but at the same time was reserved for the priests, who no doubt

consumed it in or near the temple. In connexion with this ritual, the word used for 'leg' in the Hebrew text is *shôq* (שׁוֹק), which the A.V. incorrectly translates 'shoulder,' while the R.V. makes it 'thigh' (cf. Ex $29^{22.27}$, Lv 7^{32-34}, Nu 6^{20} 18^{18}, 1 S 9^{24}, etc.). The word, when applied to human beings, means specifically the lower leg (or 'calf'), but in the case of sacrificial animals it has generally been taken to signify the hind-leg or thigh, and hence this rendering in the R.V. The discovery, however, of these particular bones in all the three Lachish temples may perhaps show that in sacrifices it signified the fore-leg, particularly the lower part. It is worth noting, too, that if these fore-legs at Lachish were *shôq* offerings, this must have been an ancient Semitic rite existing in Canaan long before the Conquest, for some of the bones were found in two large pots set in the floor of the earliest of the temples (dating from 1550–1400 B.C.). We may thus have another proof, in addition to those from Ras Shamra and elsewhere, that the Pentateuchal Codes embody elements of a pre-Mosaic nature, and that Israel's lawgivers made use of much of the ancient ritual and religious practices of the Canaanites.

Professor Georges Dossin has furnished us with a further account of the tablets (dating from the time of Abraham, *c.* 2000 B.C.) unearthed by Parrot in the palace at ancient Mari (now *Tell Ḥariri*) on the Upper Euphrates, a little south of Harran. These valuable records give a most interesting glimpse of the political, commercial, and cultural environment in which the Abrahamic clans must have lived before entering Canaan. *First*, according to the tablets, a well regulated system of communication by means of fire-signals, similar to those referred to in one of the Lachish Letters, was widespread throughout the kingdom, and was probably in existence in all the countries from Eastern Mesopotamia to the shores of the Mediterranean. Whenever sudden grave events occurred, such as a rebellion or hostile attack or immanent peril of some kind, which necessitated the rapid and safe transmission of a message for outside help, such beacons or torches were displayed on the city walls or elevated spots (cf. Jer 6^{1}, Jg 20^{38}), and could be relayed by other cities to more distant parts. Their number, movement, direction, and combination, as previously agreed upon, constituted a code or language readily understood by those having the key. It is interesting to note that the expression generally used in the Mari tablets (*išatam našûm*, 'raise up a fire-signal') corresponds exactly to שְׂאוּ מַשָּׂאֵת in Jer 6^{1}, though the latter was written about 1400 years later. *Second*, in a previous article (December 1938) we referred to the mention of the Benjamin tribes (*Benê-ia-mi-na*) in the Mari tablets. According to further discoveries, large numbers of these people (they are stated to have been 'very numerous') were installed in the Terqa district to the north of Mari, along the banks of the Euphrates —several of their towns are mentioned (*Zurubân*, *Samânum*, *Ilum-Muluk*, and *Mišlân*)—while traces of them also appear in the region of Harran, where the Old Testament places the Abrahamites. There are frequent references to their turbulent activities and hostile actions against Zimrilim, the king, during his thirty years' reign at Mari. 'The Benjamites are constantly revolting,' says one official report. Some letters refer to their exchanging fire-signals between all their towns, apparently for the summoning of their forces. In a letter on the matter from an official named Bannum, the king is strongly advised to strengthen his guards and not venture outside his city gate, while other letters show that ultimately he was forced to attack them and succeeded in defeating them. If these Benjamin tribes were Hebrews, as they appear to have been, and if there was any connexion between them and the Biblical Benjamites, the idea conveyed by JEP that this tribe was the last to develop, seems incorrect. *Third*, some of the letters attest the important rôle that divination played in Mesopotamia, and it is not unlikely that the Hebrews drew their practice of it from there, for they are known to have used rods, arrows, different coloured stones, the liver, and other objects for this purpose. King Zimrilim seems to have carried out nothing really important without first consulting certain omens, especially the liver of animals (hepatoscopy). No less than thirty-two clay livers have come to light in the palace. These are covered with inscriptions (now translated and published by Mlle M. Rutten), which were meant as *aides-mémoires* or guides for the priests and teachers. Among the Israelites this method of predicting the future was not uncommon (cf. Ezk 21^{21} R.V.), for they regarded this part of the body as specially sacred—it contested with the heart the credit of being the central organ of life. There seems some ground, indeed, for substituting the word כָּבֵד ('liver') for כָּבֹד ('honour,' 'glory') in several passages in the Old Testament (cf. Ps 7^{5} with La 2^{11}; Ps 16^{9}, Gn 49^{6}, etc.). *Fourth*, the Hurrian language occurs on six of the tablets (these are all of a religious nature). Seeing that they date from the First Dynasty of Babylon, in

other words about five hundred years earlier than those from Boghaz-keui or Ras Shamra, they are the most ancient Hurrian texts known to us so far. It is evident that Hurrian civilization must have been active as early as 2000 B.C. in Mesopotamia for the priests to have placed these texts in their library. The Hurrians, believed by many scholars to be the same as the Biblical Horites, were a non-Semitic (though not Indo-European) people, speaking a language thought to be allied to Caucasian. Hitherto they are supposed to have migrated westward into Mesopotamia and Palestine about 1900 B.C., but these tablets go to show that they were already an influence in the West at least a century before this. *Fifth*, there are numerous business and economic tablets, showing the enormous amount of commerce, both exports and imports, that was engaged in. There were constant dealings in food, drink, oil, wood, copper, bronze, lead, silver, gold, and precious stones, as well as in cattle, sheep, ploughs, scythes, and agricultural products. In this matter, we have one more proof of the widespread commercial activity that existed at the time when Abraham and his Hebrew followers were settling in Canaan. Presents of cloth, gold and silver vases, rings, bracelets, cylinder seals, and similar valuables, were also exchanged between the kings of Mari and other royal rulers. Dossin has drawn up a list of thirty-two of the most important kings mentioned. These include three of the name of Hammurabi (*Ḫa-am-mu-ra-pi*), all ruling at the same time, for in addition to the well-known Babylonian monarch we find a Hammurabi, king of Kurda (an unknown country), and another the king of Iamḫad (Ḫalab, now Aleppo). There is also known to have been a slightly later Hammurabi or Ammurapiḫ, king of Ḫana or 'Anah (on the Euphrates south of Mari), and perhaps another still who was king of Atchana, in Syria (unless this last be the Babylonian one). *Sixth*, we find mention not only of Ugarit (six times), Byblos (eight times), and other well-known places in Palestine, but there is frequent reference also to Caphtor, by which is undoubtedly meant Crete (cf. Am 9^7, Jer 47^4). Thus, we read of a 'Caphtorite vase,' a 'Caphtorite weapon,' 'Caphtorite pincers,' and other objects from Caphtor. It is noteworthy that in all cases the word on the tablets is *Kaptaru* or *Kaptaritum*, and this seems to dispose of the idea that Caphtor was Kafto (or Kefto) on the southern coast of Asia Minor. The *r* at the end of the Biblical name, it has been said, may be due to the Hebrew *o* (*waw*) giving rise to the Hebrew *resh*, and it has also been explained away on other grounds by Egyptian philologists. But since the *r* occurs in these Mari texts, as far back as the beginning of the second millennium, there is good reason for regarding it as part of the original name. *Seventh*, according to the more recently translated tablets, the name 'David' (*Dawidûm* or *Dawidâm*), which occurs so often but always as a common noun, and which was thought at first to mean 'chief ruler' or the head of a tribe, seems rather to signify 'the general commanding the royal troops,' and this is probably its original derivation, instead of the Biblical Dodavahu or Dodo.

Professor Nelson Glueck has given another interesting report of the material recovered by him from Ezion-Geber (later Elath), Solomon's seaport on the Gulf of Aqabah. It was here in this distant spot, thirteen days' journey by camel from Jerusalem, that Solomon, who was already a merchant prince, a great builder, a famous horse-dealer, and a rich copper king, manifested his vision and power by building a great manufacturing town, where the copper and iron ores from his mines in the Aqabah were smelted, refined, and worked up into finished products to be exported to Arabia, Africa, India, and other parts, in exchange for gold, ivory, spices, and other valuable imports. His activities, indeed, seem to have been manifold, for he also maintained a fleet of ocean-going ships here in partnership with King Hiram of Tyre, thus adding to his other qualifications that of a shipping magnate (cf. 1 K 9^{26}, etc.). The building of such a seaport and manufacturing centre at the juncture of the main roads from Egypt, Sinai, Arabia, and Palestine, is one of his least known accomplishments, but as Dr. Glueck says, it 'represents one of his greatest.' The most recent excavations on the site show that the builders did their work so well that, after the lapse of some three thousand years, the walls still stand fairly high (with the main gateway on the south facing the sea), while structures in modern Aqabah have cracked and crumbled within a few years of their erection. The system of smelting and refining plants, together with the intricate arrangement of flues and air channels, turns out to be much more extensive than previously suspected. Among the recent finds are some additional jar-handles, stamped like the rest, some pottery fragments inscribed with the swastika, the 'Star of David,' and the 'Byzantine' Cross, as well as some types of glass beads, which may have been brought from Phœnicia by the sailors who worked the ships. The most important discovery, however,

is that of a large broken jar, which has two letters (ḤA) of the Sabæan-Minæan alphabet incised on it, dating from the latter part of the eighth century B.C. Dr. Glueck suggests that the jar may have been of Midianite origin, but it is doubtful whether the Midianites used this form of alphabet. The Sabæans occupied south-west Arabia (the modern Yemen), the country of Queen Sheba, while the Minæans dwelt immediately to the north of them, and the jar probably came by one of Solomon's ships from this distant quarter, and may have contained spices or other imports. It is known that the Sabæans were great traders (cf. Ezk $27^{22f.}$), dealing in costly wares (cf. Ezk 38^{13}). The inscriptions on their rocks and slabs represent them as not only exporting the products of their own country, but acting as intermediaries for goods coming from India and Africa to Palestine.

In ancient Palestine, as throughout most of the East to-day, commercial bodies—drapers, goldsmiths, copper-beaters, butchers, and others—were grouped each in their own street or quarter, and this specialization continued throughout the Middle Ages, and still subsists to some extent in the older parts of Jerusalem. Jeremiah mentions the 'bakers' street' (37^{21}), which was probably near the 'tower of the furnaces' (Neh 3^{11}). The north-west part of Beth-Shemesh (*'Ain Shems*), excavated by Grant in 1933, was inhabited from the Middle Bronze Age (*c.* 2000 B.C.) till the beginning of the Iron Age (*c.* 1200 B.C.) by smiths or braziers, whose furnaces have been discovered. At *Tell Jemmeh* (the reputed site of Gerar), in the time of the later monarchy, metallurgists had their workshops close to each other in the north-west of the city. At Lachish (*Tell Duweir*) Starkey discovered that a commercial quarter existed just inside the city gate during the closing period of the kings. Here he found the fiscal bureau with its large jars bearing the royal stamp, a corn chandler's establishment, a weaver's workshop, and similar places of business. The seal of the weaver, who also carried on business as a dyer, was discovered with his name, 'Hilkiah, son of Mâs.' At Beth-zur, six miles north of Hebron, Sellers uncovered a bazaar, with its shops ranged along the south-east of the citadel. Sometimes whole towns were devoted to some particular industry. *Tell Abu Hawam* (adjoining Haifa), for example, was almost solely an emporium for Ægean pottery. Under the monarchy, *Beit Mirsim* (Debir or Kiriath-sepher) was mainly occupied with textile manufacture, for weaving plant has been discovered in almost all the houses. In many cases foreign merchants were granted certain privileged quarters (streets or bazaars) for themselves, involving the right of trading. In accordance with this arrangement, Damascus dealers had a concession in Samaria under Omri and Ahab (1 K 20^{34}), and Sidonians at the beginning of the Hellenistic era were established in the same way at Marissa (*Tell Sandahanna*). Such merchants had special privileges like those of the Frankish dealers in the Middle Ages in the towns of the Levant.

Literature.

MAN IN REVOLT.

THE Epilogue to *Man in Revolt: A Christian Anthropology*, by Professor Emil Brunner (Lutterworth Press; 15s. net), might with advantage be read first of all. Dr. Brunner's aim in it has been to show that the nature of man—if indeed man has a nature in the ordinary sense of the term—can be understood only from the point of view of Christian doctrine. Anthropology is not only a popular science, but supplies the fundamental problem of theology. Humanism tries to understand man from below, either causally in alliance with science, or teleologically in alliance with idealism. Brunner, on the contrary, holds that man can be understood, not only theoretically but actually, only from above, in relation to the Word of God, as this is given to us in the Incarnation of Jesus Christ. Man is essentially 'man in revolt,' and, as such, he stands between Creation in the Image of God, on the one hand, and sin, on the other. Sin is man's misunderstanding of his own nature, and issues in a false independence of God. The core of sin is man's reliance upon his own reason and his claim to be the 'captain of his soul.' His freedom apart from God is an illusion, but in God he can have a real freedom. In his own strength he cannot overcome the contradiction in which he stands—between his

origin and his present state. The actuality of man has diverged from the Truth of man, and convergence can be restored only through faith in Christ. Repentance is unavailing until repentance comes to mean that man accepts forgiveness through the blotting out of his past by God's atonement in the crucifixion of Jesus Christ. When the miracle of return to God takes place, man goes back to his origin. Faith is the restoration of the Image of God; it is the repeatedly victorious struggle to accept love as of the essence of God's nature and His relation to man.

But man's freedom is not destroyed by the overwhelming grace of God. In all the relationship between the Divine and the human, man is responsible. Indeed he exists only as he responds to God in Christ, and he must decide, with the intensity of a feeling of 'once-for-allness' and yet repeatedly, whether he will accept or reject the offered restoration. Man's existence is nothing in itself, but only an existence-in-decision.

From this point of view Dr. Brunner develops the main thought of his book. Man's nature should never be regarded as a 'quality,' but only as a 'relation,' and a relation to God. Forgetfulness of this, according to the author, explains the errors of naturalism and humanism on the one hand, and the defects of the Catholic and the Barthian theology, on the other.

The chapter on 'Man in History' is one of the most illuminating in the book, but raises many problems. According to Brunner there can be no philosophy of history, but only a Christian interpretation of history. In this connexion he grapples with the problem of the significance of history outside the line of Old Testament development towards Christianity. One cannot help feeling that his treatment of this difficulty is largely an evasion, and consists in saying that there is no history outside the Christian development. History, according to him, is decision, and there can be no decision in the full sense of the term except the decision for or against Christ.

Brunner's difficulty in dealing with history is connected with his fundamental conception that reality consists in action and not in nature. God Himself, in his view, has no nature; He is *actus purus*. Correspondingly there can be nothing static in man, nothing 'funded' in anything that can be called human nature. We cannot help thinking that this sharp distinction between activity and nature creates more difficulties than it solves. It indeed enables Brunner to deal with certain defects in the traditional doctrines of the *Imago Dei* and Original Sin, but it seems to weaken his otherwise helpful conception of the continuity between Creation and Redemption. If Creation is not a 'deposit,' so to speak, of God's confidence in the nature of man, creation has little meaning. Without some element of the static we are lifted out of time altogether, and it is somewhat inconsistent on Brunner's part to fall back again on temporal categories, and speak of redemption as a restoration of the original nature of man. Brunner's own words are: 'Faith is a return to man's origin and is never a new beginning out of nothing but a *renovatio imaginis*, a *re*-storation.' Similarly, Brunner opposes the idealistic neglect of the truly historical, but he himself shows the same tendency to transcend time in his explanation of the union of creation and redemption, and he describes eternal life as 'pure simultaneity.' Now, we cannot have it both ways; we must either treat history seriously, or depart from it, as the idealists do. One main cause of the difficulties with which Brunner unsuccessfully grapples is just the dominance of his idea of pure activity, and his insufficient appreciation of the consideration that Creation—and the Incarnation—involve a trust in the historical. Such a trust would seem to show itself in the Creator's bestowal upon men not only of freedom but of a point of origin for their activity—a nature which can be free. This does not involve a doctrine of the independence of men over against God, but simply gives a real meaning to the delegation of freedom and responsibility. There is much truth in Lotze's saying that creation can be understood only as the creation of creators. This book, which will be regarded as one of the most significant contributions in recent times to theological literature, has been admirably translated by Miss Olive Wyon.

THE APOCALYPSE.

It is long now since Professor E. F. Scott, D.D., established his reputation as a first-rate scholar and a singularly lucid writer on subjects connected with New Testament study and early Christian history. He puts us under further obligation by his latest work—*The Book of Revelation* (S.C.M.; 6s. net). We find here the same combination of scholarly insight and clarity of style. He leads us easily and pleasantly through many rough places. He is manifestly master of all the really vital work that has been done on the 'Revelation,' but he avoids—if indeed he so much as feels—the temptation to overburden his own presentation with an indigestible mass of details.

The 'Revelation' all feel to be a fascinating but tantalizing book. In times of crisis like the present, many who gave up the attempt to make anything of it when affairs were normal turn back to it with wistfulness. Strange enough have been the results of some attempts to expound it, yet many feel that it surely cannot be for nothing that it has been preserved to us. Dr. Scott's fresh tackling of its problems is exceedingly timely. It was in days of crisis that the book was written; for our own day of crisis it has a message. So well does the author bring that out that we assure preachers that here is the material for part of their war-time preaching. That Dr. Scott had this aim in view we do not know, but the book is eminently suitable for that, not only in what from time to time it says but what it almost constantly suggests.

The book is in five chapters. The first deals with Origin and Purpose. Here we have a masterly discussion—masterly not least in its conciseness—of such topics as the nature of apocalyptic; date and authorship; the historical situation; the form, structure and prophetic character of the book.

The second is entitled 'The Drama of Revelation,' and in twelve sections takes us through the contents of the book. Light is cast on such puzzles as the two witnesses, the number of the beast, the woman and child, antichrist, and the woes with their threefold symbolism.

The third deals with Doctrine, the fourth with 'Permanent Message,' and the fifth with 'Revelation as Literature.'

We could wish to take for fuller treatment not one but many of the topics that are indicated. But we must refrain, contenting ourselves with most cordially and even enthusiastically recommending this distinguished work. It clears up many difficulties and itself may be called a 'revelation' of the supreme genius of 'John,' who contrived to make apocalyptic literary.

RELIGION IN THE REICH.

This is the title of a remarkable book by Mr. Michael Power. Its sub-title is: *The Nazi Persecution of Christianity: An Eyewitness Report* (Longmans; 6s. net). It is an objective account, based largely on personal visits to the Reich, but drawn also from files of 'The Times' and from the Bishop of Chichester's book, 'The Struggle for Religious Freedom in Germany.' It is well authenticated in every particular, and throws a flood of light both on the nature and on the extent of the struggle that has been going on in Germany for the last nine years.

Mr. Power lays stress on a feature of this struggle which is not realized in this country. It is not a conflict between Church and State. It is one between two rival religions. The Führer was not so foolish as to imagine that he could pit himself against the faith and idealism which have always been present in the German people. What he has tried to do is to harness this religious spirit to his own political machine. He disclaims any idea of suppressing Christianity. He only wants to make it German. And all his measures have been taken in the name of a religion which pretended at first to be Christian (German-Christian), but has gradually, and more and more blatantly, cast off this pretence. In other words National-Socialism is a faith as well as a programme.

The Nazi religion has been expounded in the second most important book of modern Germany: *The Myths of the Twentieth Century*, by Alfred Rosenberg, whom Hitler appointed Minister of Culture. This book proclaims a Germanic Christ who is a 'self-confident Master,' not a sorrowing Jew. There must be no 'Lamb of God.' Germany must shake itself free of this Oriental influence, and by demolishing the intellectual degeneracies of Syria and Asia Minor raise the new, the lasting glories of Blood and Soil. What serves German honour is the one and only law. Rosenberg discards the Cross, the Sermon on the Mount, and Love, but denies that he has discarded Christianity. He does not want to sweep Christ away, he wants only to improve Him.

Opposed to this Germanic Christianity were the powerful Roman Church and the disunited Protestant Churches, and the story of this book is the record of the persistent attacks on these churches. Nothing has been too vile to be used as a weapon. The religious papers have been suppressed. Teachers who would not conform to Nazi rules have been dismissed. Pastors, in hundreds, have been imprisoned. Every instrument of oppression that the mind of cruelty and baseness could invent has been employed. The account of prison life in this book is appalling. Places like Oranienberg, Börgermoor, and Dachau have been the scenes of sadistic cruelty 'more degrading by far than the most savage rites of any Eastern tribe.' When new prisoners are brought in it is usual to keep them standing for hours and then leave them three days without food. Then they have 'drill'—which means being hounded round the prison yard, lashed with staves or rubber truncheons. Alter-

natively they are given a Nazi flogging, face, back, legs, arms and hands, that will leave them immobilized and in torment for weeks. These men have been professors, writers, artists, and clergy. They have had no charge made against them and have not been tried. The details of prison torture are almost past belief.

Lying and slanderous propaganda and physical cruelty have not succeeded in breaking the spirit of the faithful. But in one respect the Nazi regime has been victorious. It has got possession of the youth of the nation. Education in the schools and training after school age are in the hands of the National-Socialists. And this is the really serious feature of their oppression. The children are being taught to scorn the gospel and all it stands for, and to glory in force and war. Mr. Power devotes a great deal of space to this subject because he fears that success in this sphere 'may seriously weaken the whole structure of Christianity in Europe.'

The aim of the book is not to breed hatred of Germany. Its language is studiously reserved. But it does expose the real issue of the conflict in which we are at present engaged (the book was written before war broke out). And it leaves one curious personal impression on the mind. Hitler is recorded here as having made promise after promise to the Churches and consistently broken every one; and at the same time as denying that he has ever broken any. The curious impression left with us is that he honestly and truly does not know what truth means. There is a moral gap in his mind. It is this that makes him so great a menace to the world and to his own country.

THE BOOK OF PSALMS.

The ancient Syriac version of the Old Testament is one of the most useful pieces of apparatus for textual study, since, while it is far from being as important as the Greek translation made in Egypt, it often throws valuable light on the condition of the Palestinian texts at the beginning of the Christian era. An attempt to introduce it to the general public has been made by Mr. George M. Lamsa, who has printed the Psalms in a form modified at times by reference to the Syriac—*The Book of Psalms according to the Eastern Version, translated from the original Aramaic sources* (Holman Company, Philadelphia; $1.50). He has prefixed a short Introduction, in which he explains the kinship between Hebrew and the group of Aramaic dialects to which Syriac belongs. The translator follows the King James version, except where he feels it desirable to exhibit such differences in the text or interpretation as are supplied by the Syriac. Unfortunately the attempt can hardly be regarded as a great success. The work is intended for readers with no philological background whatever, and the numerous misleading statements in the Introduction are, therefore, the more serious. Mr. Lamsa has used his own judgment in deciding on the Syriac text (for which he has certainly studied the best authorities), and he may have good authority for some of his alterations—and retentions. But his version fails to give a fair idea of the Syriac version as normally printed. Some of his changes are hardly justified; for example, in Ps $90^{4.5}$ he renders the same Syriac word by 'changeth' in one instance and by 'groweth up' in the other, while in Ps 73^{9} he alters the last phrase to 'drags in the dirt,' though the Syriac means no more than the normal English rendering of the Hebrew. Sometimes he seems too reluctant to change a familiar English phrase; for example, at the end of Ps 3 he fails to add 'for ever,' keeps 'righteousness' for 'truth' (so the Syriac renders the Hebrew word) in Ps 23^{3}, and 'shall follow me' for 'have followed me' in verse 6, and fails to note that in Ps 90^{2}, instead of 'thou hast formed the earth and the world,' the Syriac has 'thou hast formed the earth and the world was established.' It should, however, be remembered that Mr. Lamsa may have at his disposal good MS. evidence which is not available for the ordinary reader. The idea is a good one, and it is a pity that it has not been thoroughly and accurately carried out. There are three good photographs of ancient Syriac MSS.

PILATE.

Readers will not be disappointed by *And Pilate Said . . .* (Rich and Cowan; 10s. 6d. net). It is not so exciting as Mr. Frank Morison's former book; but it is interesting from beginning to end. Mr. Morison went to Jerusalem to make certain investigations connected with the administration of Pilate. The Procurator comes out of this examination not so badly. His public works revealed him as a hard-working, competent, and loyal upholder of the Roman tradition. His mistakes in dealing with the Jews were due largely to inexperience and a hasty temper. His historic and far-reaching error in the trial and crucifixion of Jesus of Nazareth was not unconnected with the astute manœuvres of Caiaphas. The events of these days were really the incidents in a duel between the crafty High Priest and the less subtle Roman official.

The various episodes in the life of Pilate are told vividly and with a certain sympathetic impartiality,

and it is in the course of this narrative that bigger issues than merely biographical ones appear. One especially, to which considerable space is given, is entitled 'Revolution or Sacrifice?' The subject is directly raised by Dr. Robert Eisler's contention that Jesus was really leader of an armed Galilean revolutionary band, and that He perished in military conflict with the Roman power, which was aided by a crafty High Priest. Mr. Morison's gift of historic analysis gets full scope in the discussion of this question. He is essentially fair in his treatment of Eisler's arguments, but he has little difficulty in exposing their weaknesses. Many points of historic interest appear in the course of Mr. Morison's investigations, and the combination of biography with the discussion of really large religious questions gives to this fascinating book a particular value.

The teaching of the Hebrew prophets is of profound importance to the modern world, and a welcome is due to anything which will help us to understand them. In *The Prophets Tell Their Own Story* (Abingdon Press; $2.00) Professor Elmer A. Leslie has adopted the novel method of putting his material into autobiographical form, and making the prophets describe their own times, life, and message. His work covers the eight recognized pre-exilic prophets, and each gives an account of his own experiences and attitude. Naturally, the extant utterances of the prophets are freely quoted, and Professor Leslie offers in each case an independent translation. There is much more in his book than actual prophecy; the history of the Near East in the eighth and seventh centuries B.C. is also adequately sketched, and we can see the prophets in due perspective against their background. In substance Professor Leslie follows the normal lines of interpretation, and, while there is room for difference of opinion in matters of criticism, historical reconstruction, exegesis, and even grammar, the reader may open the book with a sense of confidence in the sound scholarship of the author, and with the certainty that he will get a fresh and stimulating vision of what these men had to say to their own day—and to ours.

The publication of the broadcast talks on Church history from Acts to the Reformation continues with Part Four on *Life and Letters of the Early Church* (Allen and Unwin; 2s. 6d. net). The Editor is the Rev. Edward Shillito, and the contributors are Professor C. H. Dodd, Mr. Cyril Bailey (the Public Orator of Oxford University), Canon Raven, Dr. N. Micklem and Dr. E. D. Selwyn. The subjects are: Letters of a First-Century Traveller (St. Paul); *Ex Umbris et Imaginibus in Veritatum* (Epistle to the Hebrews); An Old Story Retold (St. John's Gospel); a Vision of Triumph (Revelation); Rival Religions; The Primitive Church: Its Structure, Its Source, Its Scriptures; Christians Start Thinking; the Romance of the New Testament Manuscripts; Early Christian Customs; Life and Letters in the Fourth and Fifth Centuries; and Arts and Crafts in the First Six Centuries. The conjunction of these distinguished names with those fascinating topics secures a little book of absorbing quality. There is not a dull page in the volume. It is always instructive and it is always entertaining.

The Apocalypse presents so formidable an array of exegetical difficulties that many commentators, including Calvin himself, have fought shy of it. Many others, on the contrary, have rushed in where angels fear to tread, and their interpretations have in many cases been miracles of wrong-headed ingenuity. Here, however, is a book on the subject which may be heartily commended, its title *The Message of the Book of Revelation*, by the Rev. Cady H. Allen, of the Presbyterian Mission in Iran (Cokesbury Press; $1.50). Without going too minutely into detail, or trying to give a meaning to all the symbols, the writer aims at setting forth the great religious ideas of the book as seen against the background of pagan Rome. The conflict, the victory, the assurance of victory and the ground of that assurance, these are the lofty themes treated, and worthily treated. This is a timely book which would provide fine material for a course of sermons.

An admirable biography of the late Bishop of Salisbury, who was also for sixteen years Archbishop of Brisbane, has been compiled by Dr. C. T. Dimont, Chancellor and Canon of Salisbury, assisted by, among others, the Rev. F. de Witt Batty, Bishop of Newcastle, New South Wales. The title is *St. Clair Donaldson* (Faber & Faber; 12s. 6d. net). Bishop Donaldson was a remarkable man both on his official and on his unofficial side. There are chapters here by those who were brought into intimate relations with him, as chaplains and secretaries and friends. They all tell the same tale, of a wise, saintly, and shrewd Prelate and a very attractive and human man. He was open-minded enough to see and welcome the good in the 'Oxford Group' movement. And this power of apprecia-

tion seems to have been extended to quite different quarters. He did a great service, for example, by his week-end parties given to people who had a very slight connexion with the Church, at which religious and practical difficulties could be frankly discussed in an atmosphere of friendliness. His Lent Lectures, given by experts in various fields, were meant to meet the intellectual difficulties of the more high-brow circles. Similarly he showed a cautious appreciation of the spiritual healing ministry, and encouraged it, with certain reserves.

The story of these activities, and many others, is told here with a devotion and loyalty that are beyond praise. And the handsome volume will be prized by many who knew the Bishop and by many who only admired him from a distance. May we add a plaintive question: Had the good Bishop *no* faults?

Many harmonies of the Gospels have been made since the days of Tatian's 'Diatessaron' with various degrees of success. The most recent is entitled, *The Testament of Jesus: A Single Narrative of the Great Life*, arranged and translated by Arnold and Franceys Longman (Heffer; 4s. 6d. net). It is commended in a Foreword by Professor C. H. Dodd. The writers have made their own translation, but have freely used previous translations where the rendering seemed best. In such a compilation there must always be an element of arbitrary selection. In this case readers will regret in the opening pages the complete omission of St. Luke's beautiful stories of the Annunciation and the Nativity. It is the writers' hope that 'by some element of freshness it may communicate to those who read something of the excitement, something of the wonder, that Jesus provoked in the days of His flesh.'

Brought up in a strict Nonconformist household where the only Sunday game was missionary lotto, Alice Head at a tender age was able to state the exact sum subscribed to the London Missionary Society in 1894. Now, as Editor of 'Good Housekeeping' and Randolph William Hearst's 'right-hand man' her knowledge of the world is wide, and in this too short book of reminiscences—*It Could Never Have Happened* (Heinemann; 8s. 6d, net)—she gives us glimpses of her life, a life that has indeed been 'rich and strange.'

She counts among her closest friends Annie S. Swan, 'a tonic and an inspiration'; St. John Ervine; the Rev. Roderick G. Davies, once pastor of the Congregational Church at Acton that she and her family attended, and now of Morningside, Edinburgh; Mary MacArthur, the Labour leader, 'tall, golden-haired, eager and sympathetic'; and the late Ivor Nicholson, 'a man of principle, a son of the Manse.' There are few people in the literary world she has not met, and she has a happy gift of character-sketching.

Part of her office work has been to receive telegrams from Mr. Hearst such as: 'Buy St. Donats Castle'; 'Go to—Tottenham Court Road and inspect the Giraffes for age, size, sex, quality, and price' (it is here explained that Mr. Hearst had a private Zoo). She fulfils all commands; she travels as the guest of this millionaire chief in France and America; she handles vast sums of money; yet she writes placidly 'from my earliest money-earning days I made it a practice to live well below my income.' She has some very sound advice to give aspiring youth, 'think more of your employer's interests than you do of your own. . . . I never object to doing business at any hour of the day or night.' She lays much stress on early training, and says that the best office boys in her firm have come through Boy Scout organizations. She frankly admits that the discipline of her young life at home did much to fit her for the great position she so ably fills. She speaks of the difficulties the publishing trade now has to meet, and the lack of editorship—'the kind of editorship that made the *Strand* what it was under Greenhough Smith, and the *British Weekly* under Sir William Robertson Nicoll.'

God in Our Street, by the Rev. George Stewart (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net), bears a puzzling, and perhaps misleading title. It would naturally suggest a book after the style of 'God in the Slums,' but it is of quite another character. The subject is God, but there is nothing about 'our street.' The book falls into three parts which deal with God as Creator, God as the Word made flesh, and God as Inspiration. The writer makes 'no claim to originality of thought or treatment.' He has, however, read widely and can use his reading to good effect. His style is simple and straightforward, making his book very readable and well within the compass of the plain man. He attempts nothing profound, divides his matter into brief and easily comprehensible sections, and sustains the reader's interest throughout. It is altogether a very sensible and well-informed book which should prove helpful to many.

To an Unseen Audience, by the Rev. Canon Anthony C. Deane (Hodder and Stoughton; 3s. 6d. net), is a title which tells nothing about the

contents of the book. It is intended to indicate that the book was originally given as broadcast talks. These talks were twelve in number, given at intervals. After an introductory talk on the Canon of the Bible there are three talks on the Fourth Gospel, two on our Lord's Parables, two on His Miracles, and four studies in Paul's Epistles. Canon Deane expresses himself with great clearness and simplicity, but he does not talk down to his audience. He assumes their deep interest and earnest attention, and he gives them much food for thought. These popular expositions of Biblical themes are admirably done, and it is well worth putting them into print for they make pleasant reading and are most instructive.

The Bible and the Christian Religion is an ambitious title for a small book. But it is not really too ambitious for the work done by Professor Gilmour of the Chair of Church History in McMaster University, Ontario. The book is one of a series written to help leaders in religious education, and it would not be easy to find, within the same compass, a better guide. The contents include a survey of the Old and New Testaments, of the Primitive Church and the Progress of Religious Truth, and there is a chapter on the value and authority of the Bible. We heartily commend this excellent handbook. An immense amount of work has gone to its making, and its standpoint is a cautious and balanced Modernism. Its price is 35 cents, and it can be had from the Leadership Training Committee of the Religious Education Council of Canada, Toronto.

There must be a good deal of interest in the subject of Public Worship in America. Last month we reviewed (and praised) a Cokesbury book on the subject, and now there is another, equally elaborate and, in its way, equally good—*The Art of Conducting Public Worship*, by President Albert W. Palmer, of Chicago Theological Seminary (Macmillan; 11s. net). The writer has in view the Free Churches, or the non-Episcopalian. And he has been urged to his present task by the fact that so much worship in non-liturgical churches is slovenly and unimpressive. Under this urge he has surveyed the whole field, dealing with every aspect of Divine service, including the building, the minister, the material, the choir (he even devotes some space to the dress of the choristers), forms of worship, the sacraments, big occasions. He lays stress on the beauty and seemliness of the service, approves of processions and responses, appreciates the place and value of symbols in worship, and, while he cautions against mere formalism, he also protests vigorously against over informality. It is hard to believe that, even in the land of unconventionality, a minister could perpetrate the following: 'Now, folks, let's see if we can't put a little more life into this grand old hymn. You weren't half singing last time. Step on the gas now and open her up wide and let's sing till we make the rafters rattle.' It should be added that there are some excellent forms of service given as models, and that any minister may measure his own success as a leader of worship by answering faithfully the questions in an Appendix (of seventeen pages !).

"*These Things I Have Seen*," by Mary Warburton Booth (Pickering and Inglis; 5s. net), gives a moving record of religious experiences in a Mission in North India. No detailed account of the Mission Station is given, even its name is withheld and its location is vaguely indicated as being on the border of Nepal. The writer's interest is centred upon her own spiritual experiences and those of the native girls and women under her charge. Their type of religion would be judged by many to be somewhat too emotional, but the record is instructive and gives some dramatic chapters in the history of souls. The narrative is adorned by a dozen full page illustrations in colour, and the book is a marvel at the price.

Messrs. Pickering & Inglis have sent us a few calendars from their 'Golden Grain' series. The *Daily Meditation Calendar*—the most popular—has a reproduction of a painting, 'The Shepherd's Cottage by the Loch,' and a tear-off block with text and daily meditation (1s. 6d.). Two pictures by J. Halford Ross have been selected for *Grace and Truth* and *Daily Manna*. Each has a daily tear-off block with a selected text for each day (1s. each). The picture chosen for the *Young Folks* calendar is that of a chubby boy with his dog (1s. net).

A very handsome as well as a very useful volume has been compiled by Mr. Eric Parker and published by Messrs. Seeley, Service & Co.—*Anthology of the Bible* (7s. 6d. net). The book owes its origin to a chance question. The author on one occasion had to read the lessons at a Harvest Festival. The minister officiating was struck by the choice of passages and asked why these were chosen. Mr. Parker explained, but the question suggested to him that it might be useful to compile a list of passages on various subjects. What are

the chief passages in the Bible on friendship, money, temptation, sorrow, peace, children, angels, dreams, prayers, music, and many other subjects? This book is the result. The passages on all sorts of topics are printed in full, and a list of headings, a list of contents, a very elaborate list of detailed contents (covering eleven large pages), and an index are supplied. Obviously the book will be immensely helpful to ministers and others who wish to find suitable lessons for a particular subject to be discussed. Looking at it casually, one would say that, with such an elaborate apparatus, success in such a quest is assured. And, generally speaking, that would be true. But even Jove nods occasionally, and we suggest that in a second edition the caption 'Prayer' should be supplied. There is a section on 'Prayers' which contains notable prayers of the Bible, but nothing in the list on prayer as a subject. This is just a spot in the sun, however, and it may be claimed justly that few such deficiencies will be found in this helpful and beautifully produced volume.

Can a Jew become a Christian and remain a Jew? The negative answer commonly given to this question is often felt to be the greatest obstacle which prevents a Jew from accepting Jesus as the Messiah. Dr. Paul Levertoff has spent his working life seeking and expounding a positive answer; the Jew who accepts Christ may still remain a Jew, and there is room in the Church for a characteristically Jewish section. A fitting tribute has been paid to his work in a volume of short essays, edited by Father L. Gillet, under the title *Judaism and Christianity—Essays presented to the Rev. Paul P. Levertoff, D.D.* (J. B. Shears & Sons; 3s. 6d. net). The quality of the book may be judged from the names of the contributors—Dr. Oesterley, Dr. Greenup, the Rev. C. T. H. Walker, Bishop Frere, Professor Goudge, Paul Schorlemer, the Rev. W. A. Walker, and Miss Olga Levertoff appear in addition to the editor himself. Some of the subjects handled are of general interest, but the last four bear directly on Dr. Levertoff's special interests. They give us a Latin version of the Liturgy (including the Eucharist) composed in Hebrew by Dr. Levertoff, a critical exposition of it by Paul Schorlemer, and Mr. W. A. Walker's discussion of the whole question of a Jewish Christian church. The last essay is that of Miss Levertoff, who has written the most attractive piece in the collection. She has already given us, in 'The Wailing Wall,' an extraordinarily beautiful study of her father's work and aims, and her sketch of his life is a welcome addition to what she has already told us. The book is to be welcomed, not only for its intrinsic merits, but still more as a tribute to the great—indeed unique—contribution which Dr. Levertoff has made and is making to the life of the Church as a whole.

An American tourist wrote to an English friend: 'What a wonderful people your ancestors were; they not only built ancient churches for you to worship in, but ruined abbeys to admire.' Amongst the most famous of these are the abbeys of Yorkshire, and Mr. Arthur E. Henderson, F.S.A., R.B.A., F.R.I.B.A., has selected six of them (Whitby, Rievaulx, Byland, Kirkstall, Howden, and Gisborough) which he has portrayed in their present state by means of photographs and in their pristine state by means of his own excellent drawings. With each is given a few historical and architectural notes. The book which is very well printed is for the amateur and is intended to be studied *in situ—Some Yorkshire Abbeys Then and Now* ((S.P.C.K.; 6s, net). It is also issued in 6d. parts, presumably one to each of the abbeys described.

It is not often that there appears a book so satisfactory as *The Book of Amos*, explained by the Rev. T. H. Sutcliffe, M.A. (S.P.C.K.; paper covers 1s., cloth 1s. 9d.). It looks as though we had here the ideal commentary for school purposes. Mr. Sutcliffe divides his work into three parts, the first dealing with Amos 1–2, the second with Amos 3–6, and the third with Amos 7–9, each having an appropriate title. First he gives an explanation of the passages involved, boldly drawing parallels with modern conditions, and including notes on phrases and expressions which a modern reader might find obscure. Then he discusses points which arise from the text, but are of general application. Some of these are literary, others theological and philosophical, but it is seldom that he omits any matter of importance. One question, it is true, that of the problem of evil, he refuses to discuss at length—quite rightly, since it had not arisen in Amos' day. His handling of the book is thoroughly up to date; while he writes in a very simple style he obviously has considerable resources of scholarship at his disposal. One notable feature of his work is his habit of presenting alternative views adopted by different scholars, and the modesty which restrains him from pronouncing a judgment as between them. Amos is a book which lends itself to popular exposition, but we may doubt if this kind of thing has ever been done so well before, and we may hope that others of the Old Testament prophets will receive similar treatment.

Constructive Theology.

III. Grace.

By Professor the Reverend C. J. Wright, B.D., Ph.D., Didsbury College, Manchester.

The endeavour to achieve 'constructive' theological statements—the editor's desire in the present series—is the endeavour to find less inadequate words to express the abiding truth of our Christian religion. What we call 'theology' represents the intellectual life of the Church. This intellectual life is expressed, for the most part, in language: without language, indeed, intellectual life in this planet would decay and die. Yet language is itself a symbol of thought: it is not itself thought. Words are windows through which we may look into the minds of men who have gone before us: but panes of glass are often ill-made, so that the light comes crookedly through them. When we seek to discern inmost meanings expressed linguistically we are always, like St. Paul, seeing *per speculum in aenigmate*.

If we could but hold this fact in continual remembrance we should avoid that myopic pugnacity which has characterized so much past theological discussion. Instead of regarding men's words as static entities, to be knocked down—like ninepins—by dexterous argumentation, we should regard them as fragmentary and incomplete expressions, through which we are called to penetrate by sympathetic insight into the religious experiences of living minds. We should thus be delivered from the subtlest form of all idolatries, enthroned sometimes in the seats of the learned—the idolatry of the *word*.

In seeking to write constructively, therefore, about 'Grace' I need not, within the narrow confines of a brief article, discuss etymology: nor is it necessary to launch upon the tempestuous seas of 'Charitology.' What I am concerned with is not the word but what the word signifies in the minds of religious seers and prophets. If I am able to refrain, amid divers temptations, from entering upon contentious, but fruitless, issues, perhaps it may be accounted to me as 'of grace,' and not be inconsistent with the theme of the article.

I wish to say what I have to say under three main headings.

I. *The God of Grace.*

The word 'grace' has a bewildering variety of meanings in literary and conversational usage. It needs, therefore, to be said at the outset that we are here thinking of the term as applied to God. The question to be answered is: When religious men say that God is a 'God of Grace' what do they really mean?

(1) That they have said this, and, indeed, that this is perhaps the chief thing they have wanted to say, is open to no manner of doubt. When, in primitive religions, men thought of gods as friendly beings who could under certain conditions help them, they were preparing the way for the Christian thought of 'the Grace of God.' Their untutored feelings and naïve beliefs were, indeed, a *preparatio evangelica*: they were saying in their own idiom pretty much what the modern philosopher says when he declares that 'the universe is friendly.' We Christians, while mindful of the whole history of religion out of which specific religions have developed, look naturally to Israel as the rock whence our faith has been hewn. And in the Old Testament we discover how this thought of a *God who helps* found expression, 'in many parts and in many manners.' The library of books which we call the Old Testament is pervaded, and indeed dominated, by the thought of the transcendent God on whom man utterly depends and who is ever seeking to *reveal* Himself to man. It is unnecessary to undertake a close investigation into the use of such Hebrew terms as *ḥen* ('favour') and *ḥesed* ('mercy,' or 'lovingkindness') to perceive the essential teaching about the God of Grace in Israel. The 'wood' is there to be seen by all, as well as are the individual trees to be scrutinized by the botanist. The Old Testament student will, indeed, hunt in vain to discover in our English translations the word 'Grace' as applied to the nature of God where, perhaps, he might most expect to find it—for example, in the Psalms, in Isaiah, in Jeremiah. But the *truth* is

everywhere present, if not the *word*. 'Like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him': such is the Psalmist's way of speaking of 'the God of Grace.' 'Come now, and let us reason together, saith the Lord: though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow': 'Who is a God like unto thee, that pardoneth iniquity and passeth by the transgression of the remnant of his heritage? he remembereth not his anger for ever, because he delighteth in mercy': 'I am found of them that sought me not'—these are but a few utterances, taken at random, which speak of the God of Grace. They spring out of the faith that above, behind, and within man there is the Living God, the author of his being, who seeks to support him in his frailty, guide him in his perplexity, restore him in his sinfulness.

This faith passed through many vicissitudes in the course of Israel's history, as every student of her literature well knows. It had to be cleansed from a multitude of superstitions, or, as they might more sympathetically be regarded, unworthy elements. Israel had to come to see that there is but One God, not many: and so to relinquish henotheistic conceptions for a monotheistic faith. That relinquishment involved the slow and painful—and never complete—surrender of unrighteous views of God. The Jehovah of Israel had to be seen as the Lord of the whole earth; the 'chosen nation' had to be taught that God is no respecter of persons or nations, and that His 'choice' spells not privilege but responsibility; materialistic views of God's 'benefits' had to be replaced by moral and spiritual conceptions; and, in a word, all God's relations to man had to be understood in the light of His essential nature as Perfect Righteousness.

This is Israel's contribution to Christianity. No Christian who understands his own faith will make light of that legacy. He will not indulge in unimaginative statements to the effect that a doctrine of Divine Grace is only found in the Christian religion. On the contrary, he will gladly acknowledge that the historical foundation for Christian teaching is in the Old Testament. Without the doctrine of God and man found in those Scriptures the Christian doctrine of Grace has no secure standing-ground. Or, shall we say, the teaching that the Creator and Ground of the universe is a Personal God, who made man in His image and after His likeness, and who seeks to help man in his frailty and sinfulness, is the soil out of which Christian teaching sprang, and from which it derives much of its sustenance in every generation. We have but to confront the loss that would be ours were we to be deprived of the Psalms and the Prophets to realize our inestimable indebtedness to Israel.

(2) But when the theologian to-day says that the God in whom Psalmist and Prophet believed was a 'God of Grace,' what precisely does he mean?

He means, firstly, that God is *prior* to the whole created universe, of which man forms a part. 'In the beginning God'—thus the Scriptures open. God is the Reality of all realities, from whose Creative Mind all existence has sprung. The historical universe is the expression of an Eternal Mind. It is not self-derived, or self-created, but God-derived, or God-created. When in these modern days we grope our way, by the light of our theories of 'evolution,' back to the beginning of things, we find—What? Is it—'Back—back to nothingness!'? To which the reply, both of the simple man and of the philosopher, will ever be, *Ex nihilo nihil fit*. The atheists of this perplexed generation—named by themselves and others by the seemingly, but not really, less arrogant term 'humanists'—seek to evade these final questions. They tell us—in their loss of mental, moral, and spiritual 'nerve,' another way of speaking of what the religious man calls the loss of 'faith'—that 'man is the product of causes which had no prevision of the end they are achieving,' that 'his origin, his growth, his hopes and fears, his loves and his beliefs, are but the outcome of accidental collocations of atoms': and they can but exhort us to acquiesce in 'a strange mystery'—'that Nature, omnipotent but blind, in the revolutions of her secular hurryings through the abysses of space has brought forth at last a child, subject still to her power, but gifted with sight, with knowledge of good and evil, with the capacity of judging all the works of his unthinking Mother' (so Bertrand Russell in *A Free Man's Worship*). This is, indeed,

a 'strange mystery'—stranger far than the 'mysteries' of dogmatic theology: for *it* is a 'mystery' which forbids us to *think*, while *they* are 'mysteries' which are at least recognized as the *result of thought*, inadequate as all such results must be. Dogmatic humanism is a flight from thought. It stops short of the metaphysical inquiry which the facts of life themselves raise, knowing—as the nineteenth-century positivist said when he heard of the theological convictions of John Fiske—that 'you cannot make the slightest concession to metaphysics without ending in a theology.'

If, then, as sane men we would retain our faith that life and the universe have meaning, what else can we say than was said in *Genesis*—'In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth': or, as it was, I believe, even better said by a Christian prophet who was the heir of that faith of Israel—'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was Divine. . . . All things were made by him, and without him was not anything made that hath been made.' The Fourth Evangelist was the heir of Moses and the Prophets of Israel when he thus dramatically began his Gospel with the assertion that from all eternity there has been the Creating and Revealing God. It was He who *spoke* the universe into being. 'By the *word* of the Lord were the heavens made, and all their host by the breath of his mouth.'

No doctrine of 'the Grace of God' is other than a truncation which does not begin with God *as Creator*. It is to His initiative that the created universe is due. The God who was 'in the beginning' is not other than the God who now is. *He* does not change in essential nature. If with any assurance we can say that the motive which governs, and has ever governed, His relations with men is 'Grace,' with no less assurance can we say that creation itself was of His 'Grace.' It is the expression of His eternal and inexhaustible love. Where the Bible begins we ourselves must begin. In the fact that our Scriptures open with the assertion of God who 'in the beginning' created all things, there is both the profoundest philosophic fitness and the most penetrating insight of faith. Those who fashioned our Christian Creeds stood by the same philosophy and the same faith: 'I believe in God the Father Almighty ('All-Ruler'), Maker of heaven and earth.'

O God, the Rock of Ages,
Who evermore hast been,
What time the tempest rages,
Our dwelling-place serene:
Before Thy first creations,
O Lord, the same as now,
To endless generations
The everlasting Thou!

Secondly, when the theologian to-day says that the God of the Scriptures is a 'God of Grace' he means that the Creator God is the *Living* God, ever Active and Self-revealing, and that the motive of His revealing activity is His Perfect Love. I say 'Perfect' Love; for Righteousness and Love are not separate or separable 'attributes' in God. They are our human terms by which we seek to analyse and express in conceptual thought the indivisible, infinite, and uncomprehended Nature of God. We do not say that our conceptions of righteousness and love are the measure of His Infinite and Eternal Being. We say that our highest conceptions and manifestations of these are revelations of His Nature, telling us, by His Grace, what He is like.

As the pantheistic view of an Immanent Reason coincident with the universe is unacceptable to the faith which finds the Primal Love to be Initiator in creation, so the deistic view of an Almighty Artificer who, having created the universe, leaves it to itself, is impossible to the faith which finds the Living God in redemptive and revealing communion. 'God is not the God of the dead but of the living': by which our Lord surely meant that *it is the very quality of Godhead to be in personal relations with His children*. The God of Scriptural faith—and, should we not add, the God of philosophic search—is the God who, having given Himself in creation, is ever giving Himself to His creatures according to their capacity to receive.

We say, 'giving Himself.' What else can one *give*, but *oneself*? 'If I give my body to be burned,' or 'if I bestow all my goods to feed the poor,' and 'have not love'—I *give* nothing. In our endeavours to analyse and define the nature of the 'gifts' of God's Grace we employ various terms, and about

them theologians have frequently argued, sometimes to clearer understanding, but more often, I fear, to confusion and blindness. There is 'prevenient grace' (as if all grace were not 'prevenient'!) and 'effectual grace' (as if all grace, truly received, were not 'effectual'!): there is the grace when God 'reveals,' and the grace when God 'redeems': there is (according to Roman thought) the several kinds and measures of grace flowing through the channels of the seven sacraments. In such schematizations 'grace' is regarded as a kind of third-party mediating between God on the one hand and man on the other. It is a 'something' which He bestows—an 'energy,' generated by Himself, but operating extrinsically; an 'infusion,' designed and covenanted by Himself, but under the control of institutional and sacerdotal agencies.

I do not enter upon a detailed examination either of Protestant or Roman theologies of 'grace.' What I would say is that the claim to discriminate between different kinds of 'grace' rests upon human experience of what God has done for us and in us, and is, therefore, subject to the same experiential test. It is not a claim which is rendered valid by any sacrosanct 'authority.' Nor, in labelling the different kinds of 'grace,' are theologians doing any more than seeking to distinguish and express in conceptual thought the ways by which the Living God has helped us.

There are not different kinds of 'grace.' There are different ways by which we finite and sinful men experience the ceaseless and unexhausted initiative of the Living God. The Grace of God is the Self-giving of God. If we ourselves have come, through the insights of prophets and seers, to see that there is no real 'gift' bestowed by ourselves on our fellows but the gift of our-*selves*, surely what we call the 'Grace' of God is just another name for His Self-giving. The word speaks of a *personal* relationship. We personal creatures can only give ourselves to 'selves.' And God, the Personal Spirit in whom all human spirits have their being, gives Himself to such. The All-Ruler of the universe is the Self-Giver to His children.

All the language of spiritual religion is but the endeavour to express the faith that there is a Living God who seeks fellowship with His children. 'Spirit to spirit *Thou dost speak*'—that is, *Thou dost communicate Thy mind.*' 'Thus saith the Lord'—that is, *The Living God is* now *making known His will to me.* 'The spirit of the Lord God is upon me'; 'The Lord liveth; and blessed be my rock; And exalted be the God of my salvation'; 'I am poor and needy; Yet the Lord thinketh upon me'; 'There is forgiveness with thee, that thou mayest be feared'—these are but a few passages, again taken at random, which mean nothing at all unless they speak of a Living God who ever seeks to maintain, or to restore, personal fellowship between Himself and men.

II. *Grace Incarnate in Jesus Christ.*

In all this nothing has so far been said about the unique contribution in Christianity to the truth of the Grace of God. If it is an obvious untruth to say that Christianity is the *only* religion of the Grace of God, it is as obvious a truth that Christianity has both made this message central and dominating, and has filled it with a richer content of meaning than it possessed before.

Here, again, it is necessary to look beyond *words* to the living truth as it welled up in living minds. If, for example, we were to conclude that the measure of the importance of the 'Grace' of God in the minds of Christian teachers was the number of times they use the word, we should have to conclude that Paul alone among New Testament writers gave it chief importance. The word, which is never far from Paul's pen or thought, is not found in the Gospels on the lips of Jesus, while it is only in the Prologue of St. John's Gospel that it is used. Yet it is clear that what 'Grace' stands for pervaded all the teaching of Jesus, and that if any book in the New Testament is throughout inspired by the thought it is that of the Fourth Evangelist. Indeed, it is the latter who emphatically contrasts the religion of Moses as of 'law' with that of Christ as of 'grace': and it is he, also, who proclaims the central Christian message that the incarnate Word of God was 'full of grace and truth' (1[17. 14]).

The Good News of the Christian religion is expressed in the New Testament in many ways. But all these ways, raising, as they do, many speculative problems, mean essentially the same

thing. The 'Grace' of God is the Self-giving love of God to frail and sinful men: and the message of the New Testament is that Jesus Christ is its incarnate vehicle. Such a gospel does not destroy the gospel of the Old Testament: it fulfils it. It does not declare that the Eternal God *began* to be a God of Grace about nineteen hundred years ago: it asserts that the Grace of God became uniquely operative in the Incarnate Son. The God who had never left Himself without a witness, speaking and acting through prophets of all ages and races, has now spoken and acted in Him who is—as St. John's phrase in ch. 1, *v.* 14 has, with deep insight, been paraphrased—'full of self-communicating Divine life.' 'In Him,' to use Paul's vivid descriptive phrase, 'dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.' He is, to use the language of the *Hebrews*, 'the effulgence of God's glory, and the express image of His substance.'

That this message is in full harmony with what is declared, in word and life, by Jesus Himself I have already summarily stated. He whom we regard as 'the crown and criterion of all revelation' spoke of little else but of the 'Grace' of God, absent though the word was from His lips. If it is to Paul that we owe the emphasis on the word, it is to Jesus that we owe the emphasis on the truth. God is the Divine 'Father'—this was the symbol which our Lord found to be the least inadequate when He taught men about the Divine nature. A human father is only worthy of the name when it is his very nature to be, not only the initiator of life, but the continual giver of life. Upon the Divine Father, as Source and Helper, Jesus regarded His whole life to be dependent: and it was in virtue of His own unique fellowship in thought and purpose with God that He knew Himself called to be mediator of 'all things' pertaining to the Rule of the Father (Mt 11^{27}). What we call the 'beatitudes' are—not a series of moral precepts, but—different ways of saying what the God of Jesus is like, and what life in the Father's Rule is like. That Rule it is the Father's good pleasure to *give* to His sons. Jesus taught His disciples to pray to the Divine Father who was always ready to bestow forgiveness: 'forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us.'

The limits of space forbid my enlarging on numerous other aspects of the teaching of our Lord, all of which are but different ways of saying, 'God is a God of Grace,' and many of which imply that God's Grace was incarnate in the Son of His Love. The Johannine saying, 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father,' is not just the theme of the later Apostolic Gospel: it indwells the message and mission of our Lord Himself. The 'Divine generosity' incarnate in Him has nowhere a finer expression than in Jn 3^{16}—'God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son': and this verse—such, at least, is my own view—is but the expression in summary form, by the reflecting mind of the Johannine evangelist, of the inner mind and dominating sense of mission of Jesus Himself. Our Lord's knowledge of the Father, His obedience to the Father even unto death, His mission from and for the Father, is all of the Father's *Grace*. He who *gave* His own life knew Himself to be the medium of the Father's Love: and not for a few elect believers, but for 'the world.' Thus the Good Tidings is of a *gift* to be *received*, not of a *reward* to be *earned*.

III. *The Human Reception of Grace.*

I am well aware that many speculative problems remain which cannot here be considered. The chief is this: How does frail and sinful man *receive* the ever-offered Divine Grace? Or, to put the question in other terms, How is the operation of God's Grace *conditioned*?

These questions are raised by the facts of life. Some men are good, and some are bad. Some love the light, some hate it. Some have clearly found 'eternal life,' and some are as clearly strangers to it. Nor does this clear-cut dichotomy exhaust the possibilities. There are the good, the better, and the best: there are the bad, the worse, and the worst: with interminglings of good and bad beyond all human computation.

Further, if the life of the Kingdom is but reception of *Grace*, where is the room for *moral effort*? If it is a *gift*, where is the place for the *quest*? If it is a 'revelation,' where is the scope for the 'discoverer'? If it is 'Objective Reality,' how do we 'know' that it is, and what it is?

These questions raise the profoundest speculative

problems, on which the minds of men have laboured unceasingly. Milton, it will be remembered gave to the rebel angels in hell the task of reasoning.

> Of providence, foreknowledge, will, and fate,
> Fixed fate, free will, foreknowledge absolute;
> And found no end, in wandering mazes lost.

In historic places of better repute such issues have occupied less rebellious minds.

This paper is written *from within* the faith on which Jewish-Christian religion rests. It is a faith grounded on the Reality of a Transcendent Personal God, Self-manifest in His created universe. This faith has as its necessary complement the faith that man was made in the image of God and after His likeness, a likeness obscured by man's rebellious will, but never wholly lost. And it has its consummation in the faith that in Jesus Christ God's Grace was uniquely operative for the succour of men: a faith which Paul, in a moment of exceptional insight, expressed in the words, 'God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself.' With this threefold faith some Christian thinkers have associated speculative beliefs about the origin of sin, its transmission, and its radically corrupting effect on the entire human nature of every child coming into the world. With the same faith other Christian thinkers have associated another series of speculative beliefs about the institutional and sacramental canalization of saving grace. I am myself unable to regard either series of speculative beliefs as of faith: and, therefore, do not find it here necessary to pursue the inquiries to which they lead.

The Christian faith does not answer every speculative question which the human mind can raise. But it answers, as I believe, the final questions in the least inadequate way. Its vindication—and the only really satisfying vindication—is in our human experience. It is for this reason that, as I believe, any 'constructive theology' must be based on the data of experience, and not on abstract *a priori* speculation.

Now in the light of our Christian experience *we know* that God helps us often on those occasions we call 'the means of grace'; sometimes on occasions not so named. The activity of the Divine Spirit is incalculable, and it is unfettered: 'The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the voice thereof, but knowest not whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit.'

Further, *we know* that God does not *compel* us to receive His Grace. He treats us as persons, and not as things. While unfettered by the means of our ordering, His Grace is yet limited by our faith and obedience. While ever seeking to restore fellowship, the Divine Grace can never enforce it: for an enforced fellowship is a contradiction in terms. I have never, therefore, been able to regard what has been called 'irresistible grace' as other than a self-contradiction. No one is made good in spite of himself. This we know, and do not require to have it argued about. 'Compulsion,' as the unknown writer of the *Epistle to Diognetus* said, 'is not an attribute of God.' The whole history of the Divine Self-giving—whether in humanity at large, or in Israel, or in the days of our Lord's flesh, or in Apostolic times, or in subsequent Christian history—as well as our individual religious experience, makes it evident that God is no Cosmic Dictator. Were He seen to be such there could, indeed, be no more talk of His 'Grace': instead, we should have to speak of an Almighty, Impersonal Force. Before This, we might cringe in fear, or stand erect in bitter defiance, but could never bow in adoration or worship in the beauty of holiness: nor could It inspire the glad trust and obedience of sons.

The message, however, of the New Testament, as well as our own Christian experience, teaches us of the Divine Grace which awakens and inspires our willing response. 'Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us—We love, because he first loved us.' The same glad and willing response to Grace was expressed in the *Theologia Germanica*: 'I would fain be to the Eternal Goodness what his own hand is to a man.'

I close with two quotations. Chrysostom said: 'The beneficence of God is everywhere beforehand.' Von Hügel said: 'The noblest root and flower of the Jewish-Christian religion and of European civilization—the sense of *Givenness*, of grace, of dependence upon a Reality other and higher than ourselves.'

The Moods of Christian Worship.

By the Reverend George S. Stewart, D.D., Edinburgh.

This article does not attempt to make a scientific analysis of public worship. Many full and wise books on that subject are available. It attempts to present the common acts of worship, as they are affected by deliberate realization of distinctive values. To deep and vivid religion this will seem a needless task, but some have grown accustomed to the order (or disorder) of the usual worship, before the thinking powers were developed. There is a possibility, for minister and congregation, that the distinctive values be lessened by the acceptance of a devout routine which has lost the sense of progression and does not get from or give to each act of worship its full value. Each part of public worship requires a different approach, mood, attitude, mental condition. There is need for fuller realization of this, and it is somewhat neglected in the preparation of young members, and in the instruction of the congregation—possibly also in the instruction given in the theological colleges. It may be that it is counted too elementary and obvious to need instruction.

There are four large divisions which are fairly constant in the regular meetings for worship. These are :

(1) The worshipper's approach to God with Adoration, Praise, Confession, Thanks, Petition.

(2) God's response to the worshipper through the message of Absolution, the Bible read and the Word preached.

(3) The worshipper's approach to God, wearing the Yoke of Christ, united with Christ in the service of Intercessory Prayer.

(4) The Giving and Receiving of the Benediction.

It is obvious that each of these demands an attitude of mind and spirit different from that of the other three. In the first, we are the seeking and offering people, *we* do this thing. This does not rule out the action of the Holy Spirit in our doing.

In the second, God utters His responsive word, and, however active our mind and spirit may be, it is an activity of receiving, not of giving. God is the Doer, the Speaker ; we listen. This does not rule out the action of men in writing the Bible, nor of a man reading it, and composing a sermon to frame the message of God. It is a Word from God for which the worshipper listens.

In the third, the worshipper again becomes active and exercises his priestly function in bearing before God the names and needs of those for whom he prays. Here he takes his stand with Christ and shares His great work of Intercession. This is plainly a different kind of activity from that first exercised, and is the part of the worship to which the word ' Service ' is most strictly applicable.

The Benediction obviously does not belong to any of the other three divisions. In the first we speak and offer ; in the second we listen and receive ; in the third we serve ; in the fourth we receive from God the gift of a special and all-inclusive blessing.

To make these four elements explicit, and watchfully to adjust ourselves to the change of mood and spirit, makes the worship more natural, less dependent on the minister, more interesting and more real.

Within the first section, the approach to God with expression of these things which are in the heart of the worshipper, there is room for differences which are not considered here. Should adoration, or thanksgiving, or confession be the first act of worship ? Is any of these most fitly expressed by the minister as representative of the congregation, or should the whole congregation raise its voice, as in the singing of words expressive of the same desire ? Should there be responsive sentences in which, according to a custom of the Early Church, Jewish and Christian, the voice of a leader of worship is followed by the responsive voice of the congregation ? ' Lift up your hearts '—' We lift them up unto the Lord.' ' O God, make clean our hearts within us '—' And take not thy Holy Spirit from us.' Consideration of these cannot be undertaken here.

It is assumed that in the ordering of worship the

meaning of every act is considered and the best and simplest instrument for its accomplishment is chosen, this spoken, that sung, this offered in silence. It is assumed that the service is arranged so as to bring a sense of progression and completeness. The alternative is a series of devotional acts, each one of which may in itself be valuable for worship, but which are not so related to each other that the whole structure is satisfying.

To join in each part of worship with real feeling and understanding is not easy, even for a devout worshipper, and the way is made more difficult if the parts are not in natural sequence, and in fairly constant, even if not inevitable, sequence. There are public occasions, or congregational occasions, which may make alteration of the sequence fitting, but often the mood of the minister is the determining factor and a note of confusion is introduced. Whatever the order is, it makes for greater unity of worship if it be almost unchanging. So also when any one prayer has great variety of content and moves from confession to thanksgiving, to petition, back to thanks, petition again, more thanks, again confession, and so on, a worshipper may be greatly helped by listening to a good man's prayers but it is almost impossible for him to pray, in these swift transitions. If each prayer be of its own kind, calling for one mood of response, it is more likely that the worshipper will be able to pray with the leader even in the detailed clauses. At the least he will be able to follow with one general intention since the prayer moves in one area, thanksgiving, or confession, or whatever it may be.

In private worship the mind and emotion of the worshipper often make swift transitions, which spring from the reality of his converse with God. These are not possible for a worshipping congregation, unless its worship is in silence and the unity be of a wider kind than the unity of worship which is under the guidance of a human voice and has to move, at any moment, on a certain line.

The congregation passes to the reading of Scripture, and later to the sermon, parts of worship which are wholly distinct from the first, where we approach God in word and offering.

Whatever activity of the intellect and the imagination is called for here, it is an activity of receiving and apprehending, not of presentation. Man ceases his praise or pleading to listen to God's response, God's direct response. It is always given in some way; it is normally given first through the portion of Scripture read. It is almost a matter of indifference here what the position of the worshipper is with regard to the authority of Scripture, from that of the so-called fundamentalists to that of the most advanced or the most retrograde (and there are both varieties) of the so-called modernists. A sensible and devout man will listen for a message through that which is read, and if he listens he will receive.

We distinguish this section of the worship from that which precedes it, so that the congregation approaches it with this set purpose of receiving a message from God. The usual ways of announcing the reading have lost much of their power to bring this realization. It was once the devout practice at family worship, after the reading had been intimated and the Bible opened, to precede it by a sentence of prayer for understanding and grace. In a number of Sunday schools the same practice is followed, the prayer often having a musical setting, being suitable words of psalm or hymn. Some prayerful approach does help the congregation to realize the distinctive nature of this section of the worship. The first necessity, however, is for the leader of worship to visualize a congregation turning from its speaking to God to listen eagerly and expectantly for His response. With this vividly seen as reality or as hope, and in assurance that God's response is sure, the minister may be sure that the people will enter into the same vision. His expectancy will create expectancy. His sense of response from God will quicken their sensitiveness. Congregations are influenced more deeply by the spirit in which the minister conducts worship than by his talents. As he recognizes feelingly that he is dealing with 'holy' things, laden with issues of life and death, this same awe and joy will come to the congregation through his continued ministry. The people will recognize the Word of God.

In Intercession we enter on a work in which we stand beside Christ, take His yoke upon us, and share His burden. It is the distinctively 'service' element in the offering of worship, and demands

an attitude of spirit somewhat different from that of the other acts, although many interlacing cords unite it with them. We see Christ, our Lord, standing as the great Intercessor, bearing on His heart the sins and sorrows of the world, crucified from the foundation of the world, crucified till the end of time and of all we now call history. His Church stands beside Him in this, bearing on its heart the very same burden, and pleading before God the very same need. It is a different kind of act from the thanksgiving or confession, the adoration or the expectant listening. It appeals to another part of our nature and calls for a fresh girding of the loins.

This special part of our worship is moved by the same spirit as calls our Lord to His eternal work, love for God and love for men. His Intercession, our faith declares, is complete in its width and passion and prevailing grace. Ours is a broken thing, its range ignorantly narrow, its glow dim. Yet we could not thus pray at all, were it not for some share of His spirit. We may, therefore, very humbly unite our praying with the interceding of Christ and offer His praying as ours. We seek, as the depth of our praying, what Christ seeks for men. We seek for the glory of God what Christ's vision sees. We use our own stammering expression of this, now for one and now for another area of our desire, with joy that beneath our prayers lies the prayer of Christ, and the prayers of the universal Church as it intercedes 'in the Name of Jesus Christ our Lord.'

In congregational worship the life and vividness of this service is more naturally sustained when it is given a distinctive place, and when there are certain inclusive and almost unvarying phrases used to direct will and desire into each great area of Intercession, and when each of these inclusive phrases has a sequence of unfolding details of need, changing from day to day and yet so recurring that their desire becomes part of the inclusive phrase. An example of what is meant may be taken from *The Book of Common Prayer*. The great area of this intercession is the suffering human family. It holds a wide and generous desire, very simply and memorably expressed, in an unvarying phrase of daily use :

'We commend to thy fatherly goodness all those who are any ways afflicted or distressed, in mind, body, or estate ; that it may please thee to comfort and relieve them, according to their several necessities, giving them patience under their sufferings, and a happy issue out of all their afflictions.'

There is no human affliction which is not covered by this prayer, yet in its wisdom the Church of England adds to that, in the use of the Litany on certain days, a more detailed unfolding of the prayer, with presentation of many special needs, within the general heading.

Even that is not counted sufficient, and so there is prepared, for public and private use, such prayers of intimate detail as those in *The Grey Book*, and in numerous more sectional or more individual manuals or litanies of intercession.

This principle is applied to all branches of prayer. The inclusive word gathers into it an infinite variety of content, too abundant and too varied to be present in the *thought* of the moment, and yet each detail adding its colour and passion to the whole.

For this richness of intercession to grow, it is needful for the worshipper to add even to the fullest liturgical form the interest and sympathy of his own knowledge.

In the more open ways of non-liturgical worship the underlying principle still holds its wisdom, the comprehensive word, familiar and regular in use, and the expression at successive diets of worship of varying details which add vividness to the whole. This requires from the minister not only the careful arranging of the Intercessions for one service, but preparation for a series of services, when a wide range of details can be dealt with. There is, for example, at each service an intercession for the Church of Christ in all its branches, and all its work, in its need and its sin and its gifts and power. This is expressed as fitly as words can express it in some inclusive petition, and often this may be the only utterance. Associated with this, however, there may usually be at one service special mention of the Foreign Mission work of the Church, in such detail as seems wise ; at another service the work among children may be the special 'detail' ; at another, the Church's divided and discordant life ; again, the Church's part in social rebuilding, its educational work, the ministry, the parish, special-

ized evangelism, the Church on the continent of Europe, or where some special need is present, the Church bearing persecution—the list can be extended almost to infinity. Any one of these may be called into the prayers on any occasion through some providential event, or at some immediate direction or impulse, and that is good and natural. It is not good, however, when reliance on this alone brings a lack of precise preparation. The end of that is commonly narrowed vision and limited sense of need and an interpretation of one's own needs as Divine Guidance. The use of God-given faculties in thought and planning can ensure, at least, some participation by the congregation in ever-widening sympathy of intercession. The Holy Spirit will guide in this attempt to quicken the sympathy of the congregation into loving prayer, and will not withhold His immediate help at the time of utterance, enlarging and enriching what we have prepared. One of the most curious heresies infesting the Church is that the Spirit of God is hindered by watchful thought and only works through improvization.

Such a sequence may occupy a month, or a longer period for its utterance, and each of the great areas will have its own sequence of details. The larger comprehensive phrase, regular if not inevitable at each service, gathers up *and retains* the details. A father and mother, for instance, who in praying for 'the children of the Church' are guided to pray at one service for 'the safe-keeping of children in busy streets, and for help to all motor and car drivers in streets where children are' will hold that as a permanent element in every prayer for 'the children of the Church,' even if that detail be not spoken again for months.

A general attitude of sympathy and a background of faith are assured possessions of the worshipping congregation, but the service of intercession demands something more. One visualizes a congregation, purified by God's absolution as it confesses its sin, strengthened and relieved by God's response to its voice of need, enlightened by some Word of God, and cheered by the song of praise. Then it deliberately turns to a task, knowing what it is about to do, believing in the reality of the help it is casting into the sinning, suffering world as in the tenseness of its desire and faith it presents intercessions to God. This deed is a mighty charity offered for the world, in union with the prayer of Christ, and in union with the Cross of Christ. In intercession the disciple is often called to some sharing of the Cross.

This is not an impossible ideal for any congregation, indeed it is common to many in the Church, since it is a thing to which the Christian heart naturally responds. The fulfilment of the charity is made more difficult when the praying people are expected with swift changes of sympathy, thought, and will to pass from subject to subject on the unknown path which the minister treads. Every sentence may lead into an unexpected avenue. They can listen in prayerful mood, but it is very difficult to pray with quivering desire. It is probably equally difficult to keep any one inevitable form alive and moving when it is used alone. In the latter case, life and vividness are preserved when the private prayers of the worshipper are regularly associated with the familiar, inclusive prayer of the Church.

The Benediction—a sign that the close of worship has come or a real bestowal and receiving of the threefold gift of God? A devout wish or a gift? '*Missa est*' or the high point of the generous love of God? Perhaps at no part of the worship is a veil so commonly drawn between God and man, and the way of formalism made more easy. This is specially noticeable at the close of business and committee meetings of the Church, but it is common on the greater occasions. The wonder and awe of the great moment are missed and the almost unbelievable words are emptied of their richness.

Every act of worship must be treated as that which it professes to be. If this principle is applied to each part of the worship and a reverent sincerity marks each, worshippers are likely to come to this last act with growing desire to receive and growing sense of a real bestowal. When the minister comes to this last act in awe and wonder that God has commissioned him for this giving, the words will quiver and burn with the glory of their meaning—the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ—the love of God—the communion of the Holy Ghost—actually given as the supreme blessing to His worshipping people. We leave the Church thus protected and commissioned.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Lovable Goodness.

By the Reverend Stuart Robertson, M.A., Lisbon.

'Let not then your good be evil spoken of.'—Ro 14^{16}.

The prayers of little children, when they are their own prayers and not words taught them by grown-ups, are often very beautiful and can often teach something to older folk. They are sincere and real, and often a flash of forgotten truth comes from the lips of 'babes and sucklings.'

One such little child once finished his evening prayer with this petition—'Please, God, make bad people good, and *make good people nice*.'

We are all accustomed to pray that bad people may be made good, that sinners may be turned from their evil ways. How often does a service in church begin with words from Scripture which call upon 'the wicked to forsake his way and the unrighteous man his thoughts.' We believe that Jesus 'came into the world to save sinners'; and we see Him, in the Gospels, doing it, taking bad people like Mary Magdalene, and Zacchæus, and the Samaritan woman, and making them into good people. He could do it, and did. He can do it, and does; and the first and foremost thing in our faith is that Jesus is a Saviour from sin. So we sing in our hymns, and it is good to sing—

He died that we might be forgiven,
He died to *make us good*.

So we do right to pray, as the child did—'make bad people good.'

But what about the second part of the child's prayer—'make good people nice'? I don't know any church service that makes that a part of its prayers. Yet what is the use of praying the one prayer if you don't go on and pray the other?

How do we expect the Lord Jesus to go about the business of making bad people good? By some heavenly magic? By some compelling word of power? No! for even God can't make people good against their will. When Jesus walked on earth He said He would 'draw' men to Him. How? By showing them in Himself the goodness that wins love; and He works in the same way still, but as He Himself is unseen, His goodness can only be shown in the lives of His followers. The world can't see Christ, it can only see Christians, and if it doesn't see a winning and lovable goodness in Christians, it won't be drawn to Christ.

We pray, 'Thy kingdom come,' and wonder why it is so slow in coming. I think it is because, so often, good people aren't nice. Bad people never make any one love badness; but good people who aren't nice, make it difficult for any one to love goodness. In short, it isn't enough to be good, to do no wrong; we must be good the right way. It isn't enough to be sure that what you are doing is the right thing to do; you must also make sure that you do it in the right way, and the right way is Christ's way and must be learned from Him.

St. Paul knew the difference between people who are just good, and good people who are nice. He called the one 'just' and the other 'good,' and said it would be very hard to die for a 'just' man, but one would be willing to die for a 'good' man. He says Christians must be good, but also they must do it in such a way that their good will not be 'evil spoken of.' He says Christians must speak the truth, but they must speak the truth 'in love.' He says an elder must be a good man, but also he must have 'a good report of them that are without'—that is to say, he must have the sort of goodness which makes even heathen folk like and respect him.

A very great and good man, Sir John Lawrence, sent a despatch from India to the Home Government after the Indian Mutiny in which he said: 'Christian things done in a Christian way will never alienate the heathen. It is when un-Christian things are done in the name of Christ, or *when Christian things are done in an un-Christian way*, that mischief and danger are caused.'

You know what tact is? It is, literally, touch. If you are learning the piano, you have to learn not only to play the right notes, but to play them with the right touch. You may play correctly, you may play brilliantly, but you haven't played the master's music as it ought to be played if people can say, 'But what a hard touch!' If there must be sympathy and tenderness in the touch of our fingers on the keys of a piano, how much more in the touch of our life on the lives of others!

Christian things must be done in a Christian way. We must do kindnesses kindly; we must speak the truth lovingly. We must be not only just but good, not only good but nice. We must

learn not only goodness, but the tact of goodness; and there is only one Person who can teach us both these things—Jesus Christ who was full both of grace and truth.

Now when you have read this, don't fall to thinking of other people who are good, but not nice—Aunt So and So, Mrs. That, Mr. That. Think about yourself and never mind the others. Pray the little child's prayer—'Please, God, make bad people good and good people nice,' and then say, 'and both of these prayers mean Me.'

Evacuees.

By the Reverend F. W. Robertson Dorling, A.T.S., Slough.

'Out of Egypt have I called my son.'—Mt 2^{15}.

'There is nothing new under the sun,' said a wise man long years ago, and truly it is so. It may be a new experience for us to hear of thousands of children being evacuated from our big cities into country places in this time of war; but even in the far back Bible times we read of children being evacuated into safety.

I think the earliest we read of is Ishmael, the little child of Hagar. She had to flee into Egypt with him across the wilderness of Beersheba. In that desert place they could find no water to drink and the baby boy was dying of thirst. But 'God heard the voice of the lad' and sent an angel to show Hagar where water could be found. And Ishmael grew up to be a mighty man of valour and the founder of a great tribe.

Another evacuated child you will surely remember—Moses in the bulrushes. The wicked king Pharaoh had ordered every male child of the Hebrews to be slain lest the people should become too strong in the land. But you remember how the mother of Moses hid him three months and then put him in an ark on the river; and how Pharaoh's daughter found him and would have him saved; and Miriam, Moses' sister, evacuated him to his own mother! But Moses was evacuated again when he grew up to be a man and had to flee away from danger for a long time. Yet God had a great work for him to do, and called him back to be the leader and deliverer of his people and the greatest lawgiver of the world.

Can you think of another evacuee?

In a little town in Palestine, lying in a manger stall, is a little baby boy. Surely he is safe enough; he can do no harm to any one.

But again there is a wicked king who has heard that a child has been born who some day will become a king, and that is the last thing in the world that he would desire. So he gave command that every baby in that district should be slain. But God meant that little child in the stable to be saved and warned his father beforehand to flee into Egypt.

When Herod died some time after, God bade the father return home again saying, 'Out of Egypt have I called my son.' And you all know that the little baby boy, Jesus, became the Saviour and Redeemer of the world.

Now I do not say that every evacuated child will become the leader of a great tribe; or a great lawgiver to a nation; and certainly no one else can ever by any means become a Saviour of the world. Yet every evacuated child is dear to God, who does not let even a sparrow fall to the ground without His notice.

And it is up to us, if we know or meet any of these children taken away from their homes and friends through this cruel war, to do what we can to help them. Some of them may be quite happy to be in lovely country places, but after all 'East, West, Home's best.' Let us be kind to them and make them feel as much at home as can be. And there are many other boys and girls who are away from home, in hospitals and orphanages, whose lot is not such a happy one as yours. Will you remember this—that your little gift or bit of help to them is giving something to our Lord Jesus Himself. If you are making life easier or happier for any one, you are working for Him and making the world a brighter and better place. Did He not say, 'Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these, ye have done it unto me'? So every kind thing you do this Christmas time is like giving a gift to Jesus.

A Prayer.

O Father in whose family all men are children, we remember before thee all homes broken by separation in this time of war. We pray for mothers and children divided from each other, for husbands and wives compelled to live apart, and especially for homes from which the husband, son, or brother has gone to serve in the forces. Soften, we pray thee, these hard blows by the comfort of thy good Spirit. Be with the lonely. Help them to maintain the links that bind them to those they love. May fellowship in spirit be preserved, though bodily presence be denied. Teach us all that neither death nor life can separate us or ours from thy love which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.[1]

[1] Hugh Martin, in *Prayers in Time of War*, 84.

The Christian Year.

Third Sunday in Advent.

This Transcendent Hope.

By the Reverend George S. Hendry, B.D., Bridge of Allan.

'Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God, believe also in me. In my Father's house are many mansions: if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you.'—Jn $14^{1, 2}$.

Let not your heart be troubled, says Jesus. It is not easy advice to follow. The human heart is susceptible to trouble; and in all conscience there is plenty to trouble it. Is there any one of us to-day whose heart is not troubled by fear of what to-morrow may bring—to ourselves, to our children, to our people, to the world? It is difficult to take Jesus at His word when He says, Let not your heart be troubled. It was difficult for the disciples when the words were first spoken; for the prospect before them was such that, strangely, even Jesus Himself was moved to say, 'Now is my soul troubled.' It is equally difficult for us to-day. The prospect before us to-day calls to mind that time of world-agony which Jesus described in the haunting words: 'distress of nations, with perplexity; the sea and the waves roaring; men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth.' How can we be expected seriously to listen to Jesus when He says, Let not your heart be troubled? Unless Jesus has something else to say which gives force to His words.

Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God, says Jesus. Ye believe in God—that does not seem to make it any easier. Rather it makes it infinitely more difficult. For is it not just the heart that believes in God that is most profoundly troubled when it contemplates the aspect of things? To believe in God, to believe in a rule of righteousness, a moral government of the world—the facts scarcely encourage us to do that. So often we see the vilest exalted and the innocent crushed to the wall; we see things happen that baffle us and make us exclaim, Why does not God put a stop to it? we see such potentialities of evil concentrated in single pairs of hands that we cry out, Why does God not strike these men down?—I have heard that very question asked several times.

The philosopher comes along and says, Wait, don't be impatient; you must take the long view; things will work out all right in the end; the mills of God grind slowly. As Goethe said, God does not make up the account at the end of every week. But in the long run goodness will obtain its reward, and wickedness will meet with retribution. Even assuming this were true, however, it does not comfort us greatly. Whatever things may be 'in the long run,' our life is certainly not one of them. It is a short run. The days of our years are threescore years and ten—and surely, if the moral government of the world has any meaning at all, that meaning must be seen within the compass of your life and mine. What comfort is it to us if one day, perhaps a thousand years hence, the ideals and hopes we have cherished are realized? We shall not be there to see it. What comfort is it to those who to-day are the oppressed and afflicted, the insulted and scorned, that some time in the future there is coming—

> The day in whose clear-shining light
> All wrong shall stand revealed,
> When justice shall be throned with might,
> And every hurt be healed?

Tennyson once complained of Nature because—

> So careful of the type she seems,
> So careless of the single life.

Are we not entitled to make the same complaint against God, if it means that, whatever happens to you and me, righteousness will triumph in the long run? If that is what Jesus means, it is difficult to see how we can accept His 'Let not your heart be troubled.'

But I don't think that is what Jesus means. He says, Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God, believe also in me. Believe also in me. He means, Believe in God through me. It is that formula we often repeat so unthinkingly that gives us the key to the faith that can still the trouble of the heart, 'through Jesus Christ our Lord.' Our faith must be informed and directed by Him, not by the historians, the philosophers, the poets, the statesmen, and certainly not by the journalists. It is Jesus who shows us what God is like, and what God's method is. 'I am the way,' He says, *i.e.* God's way, God's method. We never come to a real faith in God unless we come by that way, by Him who is the way.

And what is the way? There are two things to be said. First, God's way, as it is in Jesus, is the way of the Cross. God does not hurl down thunderbolts from heaven upon the wicked; He does not execute what men are pleased to call 'divine judgments.' He places Himself by the side of sinners and takes their sin upon Himself in infinite,

suffering love. The method of God's judgment is atonement and forgiveness. The emblem of His rule is not a sword but 'a Lamb slain from the foundation of the world.'

It is exceedingly hard for us to learn this lesson. Secretly or openly we crave for a clear vindication of righteousness and retribution upon the wicked. We echo Philip's plea, Show us the Father and it sufficeth us—Let us see the hand of God at work and we shall be satisfied. It is hard for us to realize that 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.' We see the hand of God at work—pierced by a nail on the Cross. We see the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ—a face so marred more than any man, spit upon, crowned with thorns.

That is why Jesus says, Let not your heart be troubled. He is with us just where the heart is troubled. He has made its trouble His own. God is not remote, waiting to do something drastic at some distant future. God is with us, active to-day. In all the sin and suffering and perplexity and sorrow of the world God is near. His place is right in the centre of it all—upon the Cross.

Then the other thing is this. When Jesus says, Believe in me . . . I am the way, He means the way of the Resurrection. God's way with the world is not destruction; but it is also not reformation; it is re-creation—'a new heaven and a new earth in which dwelleth righteousness.' Jesus does not say that we have got to make this; He does not say that if only those who believe in God would get together and set to work they would soon build Jerusalem in England's green and pleasant land. He says, In my Father's house are many mansions . . . I go to prepare a place for you . . . and I will come again and receive you unto myself. It is the gospel, the good news from God; and if we believe Him, then we may really let our hearts be not troubled. I go to prepare a place for you. He does not say, You go and prepare a place for me. If He had said that, then our heart would have reason to be profoundly troubled. But—in my Father's house are many mansions; therefore, let not your heart be troubled.

The trouble of the heart which Jesus speaks of here is not only fear. There is another trouble, which, though not so painfully felt, is just as potent in its consequences for evil; and that is illusion. When Jesus says, Let not your heart be troubled, He would free us of all illusions regarding the future by directing us to the one hope which is grounded in the gospel of God. He gives us the hope of a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God. He does not bid us seek an unattainable ideal. He tells us, In my Father's house are many mansions.

Don't say that this is other-worldly and unpractical. It is not. Jesus expressly said so. 'He that believeth in me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do, because I go unto my Father.' The promises of God are surer and more inspiring than the prospects of man. And, in truth, the best service has been given to the world by those who have remembered that the fashion of this world passeth away.

It is this transcendent hope we need to-day. The world in which we live is sick. It is sick because it has concentrated its attention and built its hopes upon itself. It has sealed itself up hermetically. And now the atmosphere has become foul, and men are jostling and trampling upon one another in their desperate struggle for breath. What we need is to open the windows of the world to expose the broad horizons of the Beyond, and let the wind of heaven blow fresh and pure over the earth. We need to recover the perspective of eternity, so that we may see the things of time in their true proportions. And that just means: we need men and women whose hearts are not troubled by fears or by illusions, because they believe in God through Jesus Christ who died for us all and rose again and is gone to prepare a place for us, where, In my Father's house are many mansions. We may surely believe Him; for He doubly assures us, If it were not so, I would have told you.

Fourth Sunday in Advent.

The Thorn that Bloomed at Christmas.

'Instead of the thorn shall come up the fir tree.' Is 55^{13}.

Let me call back to your minds to-day the old legend about Joseph's staff which budded, one of the stories which are associated with Glastonbury, so rich in historic memories. The story runs like this. Joseph of Arimathea, according to the Gospel narrative, had been a disciple of Jesus, but secretly for fear of the Jews, after our Lord's death and resurrection became an open disciple and an earnest Christian missionary. When Jerusalem was taken by the Romans in the year 70, and the Christian Church there was broken up and its members dispersed, Joseph, we are told, went first of all by ship to Gaul—the modern France.

In process of time he got to hear of the island of Britain, which was still heathen. He determined to cross the sea and preach the gospel there. So, taking boat from the northern coast of France, he landed somewhere in Cornwall. On the day before Christmas he and his companions came to the beautiful island of Avalon—the modern Glastonbury, and here, on a sloping hill, he and his disciples, tired out with their wanderings, sat down and rested. The night was spent in a little wattle hut beside the river, and before he went to sleep he stuck his thorn wood staff, which he had brought with him from Palestine, into the ground near the hut. 'For here,' said he, 'I will build a church.'

As he awoke on Christmas morning early and looked forth to praise God for the day, behold the staff had miraculously blossomed in honour of its Lord. The staff grew into a great thorn tree, and near it they built the first Christian church in England—a mere wattle church it was at first, but it ultimately developed into that splendid Abbey whose ruins people travel long miles to see. But the legend says that it wasn't once the thorn tree bloomed at Christmas. Each Christmas the miracle was repeated. Flowers blossomed on it in midwinter. And this is what interests us—that it was on Christmas Day the thorn budded. It was on Christmas Day that there were roses instead of thorns.

All this seems to be just a parable of what happens every Christmas, not to the trees—the trees stand, stripped and gaunt and bare—but to men and women, and that is something more wonderful still. For that is the amazing thing about Christmas—even people who at other times are more than a little prickly blossom out into kindness and geniality at Christmas. That is what makes Christmas in many respects the happiest time of the whole year. There is so much kindness abroad. As a rule when we pass people in the street we content ourselves with a mere nod of recognition, but on Christmas Day a nod is not enough, we stop and shake hands and wish one another a Happy Christmas. At other periods of the year we can neglect and forget old acquaintances. But when Christmas comes near we remember them. And then at Christmas we remember the poor and the needy. We like to think that little children have a happy time of it then. So we open our pockets and subscribe to the various Christmas funds which make their appeal to us. The simple fact is—there is more generosity and love in the world at Christmas than at any other season. The weather may be cold but human hearts are warm. It may be midwinter by the calendar, but it is love's midsummer. The thorn tree still blooms at Christmas.

We cannot say that all men are consciously aware that it is the coming of Jesus into the world that accounts for the change in them. But in the last resort it is all due to Him. It is He who has taught us we are all brothers because sons of the one Father. It is He who has told us that it is more blessed to give than to receive. Christmas is specially the children's festival. It is good to be a child at Christmas. The children don't at present realize to whom they owe it. But when they are older they will realize they owe it all to the little baby who was cradled in Bethlehem's manger. The world wasn't a particularly happy place for children before Jesus came. They were neglected and despised. If unwanted, they were cast out and left to die. But Jesus by His coming has changed all that.

In another way the thorn tree has bloomed at Christmas. There are homes which can't be merry to-day, because sorrow has visited them. There are parents who rather dread the coming of Christmas because it reminds them of children they have lost. There are other homes in which dear ones lie ill. And we can't forget that Death stalks through the land even on Christmas Day. These are the thorns that tear and pierce us. But Christmas has done this for us—it has made us sure of the love of God. For the birth that took place at Bethlehem was an Incarnation. It was a case of God coming into human life. It was the Word—the Word of God—who *took* flesh in Jesus. He was not simply born—He came, thinking not His equality with God a prize to be clung to. For love He left His heavenly throne for Bethlehem's manger, and love animated Him all through life. It was a love that made Him sympathize with the sick and the sorrowful, and had healing kindness for the outcast and the lost. And this love which impelled Him to that life of ministry made Him at last die on Calvary's cross as the only way by which He could save and redeem mankind.

And the love that we see in Jesus is just the love of God. Did He not come to reveal the Father, and now we know Love rules and takes these hard and bitter things of life—sorrow and pain and loss—and with our will makes them work together for our good. And to know *that* makes all the difference. To know that it is a Father who is on the throne, to know that—to use a sentence which we may have heard quite often recently—our Father 'drives the train,' is to take the sting

out of pain and sickness and loss. It made all the difference to Jesus Himself. 'The cup which the Father hath given me, shall I not drink it?' We should never have known God as the Father had it not been for Jesus! but by making us sure that it is our Father who rules, we can see love even in pain and loss. 'Help me to praise,' wrote Samuel Rutherford from his prison at Aberdeen, 'the Lord driveth a furrow through my soul, He purposeth a crop.' The thorn for him had bloomed at Christmas.

There was another thorn tree that men expected to bloom when Messiah was born. They expected hate to give place to goodwill, and war to give place to peace. Every picture of the coming of Messiah that we have in the Old Testament pictures that coming as issuing in the reign of peace. 'All the armour of the armed man in the tumult, and the garments rolled in blood, shall even be for burning, for fuel of fire. For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given.' 'In his days shall the righteous flourish and abundance of peace till the moon be no more.' 'Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.' And when Jesus was actually born that was the song the angels sang, 'Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, goodwill towards men.' Milton in his great poem on the Nativity pictures the world as being at peace when Jesus was born in Bethlehem:

> No war, or battle's sound,
> Was heard the world around;
> The idle spear and shield were high uphung;
> The hookèd chariot stood,
> Unstained with hostile blood;
> The trumpet spake not to the armèd throng;
> And kings sat still with awful eye,
> As if they surely knew their sovran Lord was by.

Milton may have been exercising a poet's licence when he wrote those lines. At any rate the world has never been peaceful since. At this very moment the most awful war known to history is being waged and all the nations are busy arming themselves for the struggle. This thorn seems a long time in blooming. And yet we are convinced that Christmas will yet make this thorn to blossom. Take this simple fact into your consideration and ponder on what it means. War is by an increasing number of people being regarded not simply as a folly but as a crime. Go back a very few years and we find war regarded as the normal and natural way to settle national disputes. But Jesus has been changing the mind of the people and transforming their attitude. And despite the dictators with their new worship of force, and despite the militarists, there are masses of courageous souls who are determined that not only will the forces of aggression be defeated, but that afterwards a greater victory will be won for peace and civilization. Christmas will make even that stubborn thorn to bloom—and instead of wars, inflicting intolerable sufferings and losses upon the people, there will be the recognition that we all belong to one another, and there will be goodwill amongst men. So let us thank God for Christmas, and the promise and prophecy of a redeemed and transfigured world.[1]

Sunday After Christmas Day.

For Righteousness' Sake.

'Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness: for they shall be filled.'—Mt 5[6].

In one of his famous sermons F. W. Robertson says that the sculptor cannot look at his last statue, nor can the author find pleasure in re-reading his last book. It is a fine way of saying that the best among us are never finally satisfied with our attainments.

The truth is that each of us, in the depths of our being, longs for inner harmony, for peace, for a sense of wholeness and completeness. Sometimes we confuse this with a longing for happiness. But we are mistaken.

Now, this hunger and thirst manifest themselves in many different ways. Life is a long series of urgings, cravings, desirings, and wants that are never fully satisfied. For some, these are revealed in the quest for fuller knowledge. Tennyson has put these words into the mouth of Ulysses:

> I am a part of all that I have met;
> Yet all experience is an arch wherethro'
> Gleams that untravell'd world, whose margin fades
> For ever and for ever when I move.

Hence—

> this gray spirit yearning in desire
> To follow knowledge like a sinking star,
> Beyond the utmost bound of human thought.

Others seek satisfaction in pursuit of ambition or success or something else. All are hungering and thirsting for what they have not got. Jesus read the signs and went straight to His point. Men cannot find satisfaction in these things. They may

[1] J. D. Jones, *Keep Festival*, 36.

not fulfil their lives in these ways. Such aims may have their value and their legitimate place in our lives, but more is needed. There are others, not only among the crowd that listened to the Great Teacher but in every generation, who seek fulfilment on higher levels. Some seek it, as Dr. Reid points out in his study of this beatitude, along the line of duty and conscience. None will deny this is a high ideal to set before us. It comes very close to what Jesus had in mind. Yet it, too, misses the mark. Higher visions continue to beckon, and higher voices keep breaking in. Duty is not enough.

So one might go on. In many other ways men seek to acknowledge the claims that God is making on them, and so quench the thirst and satisfy the hunger, and quieten the conscience. But none ever gets rid of the driving force of his desires. Perhaps we are not meant to do so. When desire fails, life is ended. That is the mistake that many of us make. If we try to get rid of our desires we are in the same case as the man who in obedience to ideals of conduct tries to get rid of his temper because it lets him down. He cannot get rid of it in that way. The right thing to do is to recognize its true place in life and to change its direction. Satisfaction comes, not in any effort to rid ourselves of the hunger and thirst of the soul, but in changing their direction, in disciplining them by harnessing them to the ends for which God gave them. As Augustine once put it: 'God has put salt into our mouths that we might ever thirst after him.'

What is this Righteousness for which Jesus is pleading? To what does He want us to harness all the moral passion of which we may be capable? The Old Testament set a high level, but the New Testament strikes a deeper note and sets before men a more excellent way. The righteousness of Christ is a twofold relationship. It is a right attitude to God, and a right attitude to man as its corollary. It is summed up in love of God, and love of man. In fact, He requires of us the same spirit that was in Himself. His righteousness is the incarnation of His own Mind in men. To hunger and thirst after righteousness, to be possessed of a great compelling moral passion for the perfection of holiness, or wholeness, that we see in Jesus, is to tread a path that brings its daily satisfaction. The satisfaction comes as we tread the path. What a message it is for our own times! Until now the great majority of mankind have paid little heed to this word 'satisfied.' They have tried to drink from many 'broken cisterns,' but satisfaction has eluded them. In the political realm we have tried the 'balance of power,' 'collective security,' 'peace pacts,' and the League of Nations. Mr. Raymond Gram Swing, who broadcasts to us the American point of view, has told us that in American opinion, which, likely as not, as an onlooker, sees most of the game, all these expedients are now dead and that something better must take their place. He has not told us what that 'something' better is.

We have failed because we have not yet taken the way of Jesus. Perhaps God Himself, for God does work through the historical process, and in the long run, despite the hampering folly of men, He makes all events serve His predetermined ends, has smashed these things in order to impress on us the better way, the way of a great passion for righteousness. The Kingdom of God, to which Christian character is the key, and for which men are hoping and praying as never before, even if they do not express themselves in this way, has its social as well as its individual aspects. What is most needed to bring it into existence in place of the expedients that have failed us is to rehabilitate faith in God, and as a consequence faith in our fellow-men. God's world will work only in God's way. Give Him the chance for which Christ so passionately pleads and a great new era of liberty and light would open out before our wondering eyes, and the whole human race would be lifted up into a new plane of power and service. Christ has promised it. 'Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness: for they shall be filled.' Cultivate a great moral passion.

More than that, other practical consequences immediately follow. A great moral passion will *save us from chaotic aimlessness* and will give us both a goal and a soul! George Bernard Shaw sees this clearly, and in his play, *Man and Superman*, he puts these words into the mouth of Jack Tanner: 'What we need is moral passion. Only that can control our other passions. It becomes the organizing principle of life. It finds our passions a riot of appetites and organizes them into an army of purposes and principles. My soul was born of that passion.' Just so. But Jesus saw that long ago and went deeper. His language is far more precise. 'Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness: for they shall be filled.'

Again, a great moral passion will *save us from weakness and give us strength.* It gives us strength because it links us to God, who is the source of all true morals. And it releases His power in our lives. As one great thinker has put it, 'To frame an ideal and to pursue it is to be partaker here and now of an infinite life.' Some one has well said that irreligion

is really a declaration of lost faith in life, that in the end life means nothing. But religion is the declaration of undiscourageable faith in God, in man's spiritual origin and destiny, in the endless possibilities of human life, and in its eternal meaning. When that gets deep into the human soul it releases power and saves us from weakness.

And in the last place, it *saves us from fear*. Men are full of various fears and forebodings. The trouble is that our fears tend to bring into existence the very things of which we are afraid. They rob us of our values. And the more we wrestle with our fears the more heavily we allow them to impress themselves upon our minds. We need not be the victims of fears. We can put something better in their place. That is the best way to deal with every sort of fear. Moral passion will cast them out. Modern scientific thought is beginning to realize this truth. Jung, in his book entitled *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*, writes: 'Among all my patients in the second half of life there has not been one whose problem in the last resort was not that of finding a religious outlook in life. It is safe to say that every one of them fell ill because they had lost that which the living religions of every age have given to their followers, and none of them has ever been really healed who did not regain his religious outlook.'

Wonderful testimony from an unexpected quarter. Shall we listen to it? In Isaiah's day the prophet sadly complained, 'Why do ye spend money for that which is not bread, and your labour for that which satisfieth not?' To-day he would speak in the same vein.

There is a hunger of the soul which only God can satisfy.
There is a thirst which only God can quench.[1]

FIRST SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

The Consecrated Life.

BY THE REVEREND STEWART MECHIE, M.A., EDINBURGH.

'. . . And how ye turned to God from idols to serve the living and true God; and to wait for his Son from Heaven.'—1 Th 1[9f.].

Here is a good definition of a Christian. He is one who has turned and is now serving and waiting. All three verbs are important, but not equally so. For a full Christian life all three are necessary. Without one or other of the latter two there is something seriously defective; and without the first there is no Christianity at all.

1. *There are some who have turned and are waiting, but not serving.* Little need be said of this for it is not a common error; yet it does exist in certain circles. One has heard of a lady who became so convinced of our Lord's immediate return in the clouds of heaven at Jerusalem that she gave up her home, settled in the Holy City, and, when a near relative of hers was returning from the Far East in ill-health, refused to go even to Port Said to see him lest the Lord should come during her brief absence from Jerusalem. That is an extreme case; but the same thing in a measure may be seen in many Christians belonging to branches of the Church which stress the Second Coming. With some it becomes an obsession, so that they neglect the tasks and responsibilities of Christian service through waiting and watching for the Lord's Return.

2. *There are some who have turned and are serving, but not waiting.* That is true of many of us. We are not waiting for God's Son from heaven, and that in a double sense, corresponding to the double sense which may be given to the idea of Christ's coming.

On the one hand that may mean His coming to each one of us at our own death, according to the word—'if I go and prepare a place for you I will come again and receive you unto myself, that where I am there ye may be also.' On the other hand it may mean what is usually known as the Parousia or Second Coming. Is it too much to say of most of us that, without denying these two comings of the Lord, we are not waiting for them?

Let us admit that we cannot anticipate the Second Coming exactly as St. Paul's Thessalonian readers did—an immediate visible event, a literal coming in the clouds at any moment. But there is to be a day of the Lord, a day of reckoning, a climax to the present stage of human history. The Second Coming is no mere outworn trapping of Jewish thought which in more enlightened days we may discard. It is of the essence of the faith. The victory which our Lord won at Calvary over sin and death is yet to be completely realized and made manifest to all the world. He taught us to pray, 'Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven.' The doctrine of the Second Coming proclaims the Christian assurance of that final triumph of God's will which is the ultimate justification of our trust in God. Without that assurance our Christian service will lack some-

[1] J. Short, *All Things are Yours*, 51.

thing both of zeal and of imperturbability, both of persistence and of patience in dark hours.

> And when the strife is fierce, the warfare long,
> Steals on the ear the distant triumph song,
> And hearts are brave again, and arms are strong.
> Hallelujah !

As much must we say of the waiting for our Lord's coming to each of us at death. Too little have we appropriated the full gospel of the Resurrection. Too often do we think of death as the ultimate tragedy, the quenching of our fairest hopes, the last word in evil; too seldom do we think of it as the Lord's coming to receive His own to Himself. This lack of waiting, also, may affect our Christian service adversely. We are to serve the living and true God with that element of detachment which comes from recognizing that our time is short at the best and that the Lord may call us at any time, leaving others to carry on the work, but that we are immortal till our work is done.

One cannot deny the name of Christian to servants of the Lord who may lack this expectant waiting, any more than one can deny it to those with whom this waiting has become an obsession; but the New Testament does suggest that the full Christian life demands this forward look both to our own death and to the triumph of Christ on the scale of the universe.

> With parted lips and outstretched hands
> And listening ears thy servant stands,
> Call thou early, call thou late,
> To thy great service dedicate.

3. *There are some who are serving and, perhaps in some modified sense, waiting, but they have never turned.* It may seem a hard thing to say that they are not Christians at all, but the New Testament confirms it. 'Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you; depart from me, ye that work iniquity.' Notice, here are people serving the Lord, yes, serving Him in dramatic and successful fashion, yet He knows them not. Mere zeal for Christ's cause is no guarantee that we are the genuine brand of Christian. Without this preliminary turning all our service is no Christian service, and we cannot make our service a substitute for our turning.

There is a place for service in the Christian life, but it is as a consequence of salvation, not as its cause. We do not serve God in order that He may save us. He saves us in order that we may serve Him. No multiplying of activities or austerities can take the place of Christian faith, and faith means precisely this turning to the living and true God from idols—first from that biggest idol of all which is just ourselves as the centre of our little world, and then from all the idols of the mind, false ideals and mean ambitions. It is from these we must turn. Is it not possible that in some of our Christian service we are really hiding from God and trying to evade His coming to grips with us?

One has sometimes been perturbed and even shocked in reading the works of the old evangelical preachers to notice how insistent they are that unregenerate man can do nothing good. All the virtues of the heathen, they say, are but splendid vices. One feels that in such statements there is an intolerance and pharisaic quality that is far from the mind of Christ. Yet, perhaps these old preachers were expressing in a wrong way something quite right, important and even vital, namely, that to offer Christ a great many things that He does not supremely want is an insult, if we have not first given Him the thing which He does supremely want—ourselves. If that sounds a hard saying to some of us, then we are the very people who need to take it to heart. All the service we are capable of is no substitute for turning to our Saviour and receiving Him. We cannot serve Him acceptably till we have turned to Him and received Him. A Christian is one who has turned to God from idols, chiefly from that biggest and subtlest idol of all—self. Only when we have done that are we able to receive all that God has to give us in Christ—forgiveness, cleansing, the Holy Spirit, life eternal, the power to serve Him and to wait for His Son from heaven.

Simon and Lucius: Where did they come from?

A Plea for Cyprus.

By the Reverend Eric F. F. Bishop, Newman School of Missions, Thabor, Jerusalem.

The commentaries, though they all seem to disagree over whether Simon the Cyrenian, who carried the Cross after Jesus, was a visitor in Jerusalem at the time of the Crucifixion or was a Cyrenian Jew, who happened to be domiciled in the Holy City, are quite sure that the adjective used in describing him can only refer to the Cyrene in North Africa, where there had been a large Jewish Colony since the days of Ptolemy I. Cyrene was certainly an important place. The commentaries differ also in their interpretations of 'coming in from the field,' as to whether he was just a 'fellah' returning from his work (though midday would surely be rather early for this[1]); or a visitor who had to find accommodation at the feast time outside the city in one of the surrounding villages. Another thinks that he *must* have been a stranger; and that was why the soldiers coerced him into bearing the Cross. Dr. Torrey, however, while accepting the theory that he was a 'fellah' (farmer), makes assurance on this fact doubly sure by suggesting that the word translated in our Mark from an original Aramaic as 'Cyrenian' also means 'farmer.' There is no need, therefore, to go as far afield as Cyrene in the modern Tripoli to discover the whereabouts of the 'father of Alexander and Rufus.' 'The statement that the man was *coming from the field seems to decide in favour of* "*farmer*," "farm-labourer," as the original reading.'[2] From the point of view of the Synoptic Gospels this would mean that an original misunderstanding of the meaning of the Greek word having got into Mark, the same mistaken word κυρηναῖον naturally appeared in Matthew and Luke.[3]

It may be worth while looking more precisely at the actual phrase used by St. Mark, and at the way in which it was treated by the other two evangelists. Mark has: 'They compel a passer-by, a certain Simon, a Cyrenian, coming from the country, the father of Alexander and Rufus, that he should bear his cross.' St. Luke is faithful to his authority, only he not only alters ἀγγαρεύουσιν to ἐπιλαβόμενοι and adds the words ὄπισθεν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, but his τινα comes after Simon, while Mark has it in front. Should we accordingly translate, 'Simon, a certain Cyrenian'?[4] D, however, in Luke has Mark's wording in the ordinary versions. St. Matthew shortens to 'a Cyrenian man, named Simon.' St. Luke retains Mark's 'coming from the country,' and alters the phrase about the carrying of the Cross, which particular phrase the First Gospel retains as it stands in Mark.

There is surely a touch of intimacy in the words both of Mark and Luke. In the former case this reveals itself in the mention of the two sons, as if Mark at any rate knew something of the scene, if not from Simon, then from one or other of the sons —Rufus, if there is anything in the suggestion that it was he who received the apostolic salutation of Ro 16; though, if the last chapter of Romans be reckoned as meant for Ephesus, this would not necessarily be because of any connexion between the Second Gospel and the Church of Rome. In St. Luke's case perhaps the intimacy may be found both in the softening of the ἀγγαρεύουσιν of Mark, and in the more delicate way in which Simon shared the heavy load. If St. Luke ever saw Simon, it is surely possible that the latter looking back was glad not to think of any coercion needed, even though it was a military imposition; and Luke would remember that twice in his Gospel he had mentioned the Master's call to bear the Cross *after Him*.[5]

[1] The Palestinian fellahin come home about 3 p.m.
[2] *Our Translated Gospels*, 131–2.
[3] Mk 15^{21}, Lk 23^{26}, Mt 27^{32}.
[4] See Vincent Taylor, *Behind the Third Gospel*, 54–55.
[5] Cf. Creed's *Commentary*, *ad loc.*

Then there is the absence of the article in nearly all the authorities. It is true, on the other hand, that in the Codex Bezae the article does occur both with Σιμῶν and Κυρηναῖος; while in 565 the reading is Σιμῶν ὁ Κυρηναῖος, which is quite the natural sort of order of the words that anyone would expect.[1] The question, however, is whether in English the omission of the definite article is justified. It is, of course, faithful for the most part to the absence in the Greek; but may not this very absence be simply due to there not being a definite article in Aramaic, in which language *in any case* the story would first be told? One point in this particular adjective is surely to differentiate 'Simon the Cyrenian' from the other Simons who figured in early Christian history. To-day we speak of him as 'Simon *the* Cyrenian' rather than '*a* Cyrenian.' But it must have been thus that he was known all the time and by all his friends and neighbours. What perhaps adds interest and importance to this contention is that most of the earlier translations into Arabic both of Mark and Luke have quite definitely 'Simon *the* Cyrenian.' In Matthew naturally it is always indefinite. In the versions in use in Arabic-speaking churches to-day, Roman Catholic and Protestant, the adjective is definite in Mark, but not in the other two. This Markan 'use' has just the right feel; to-day men are known all over the Arabic-speaking world by their *nisba*,[2] in addition to their own and possibly their fathers' and grandfathers' names. The main point was not that this Simon came from far off Cyrene, even if he did, but that he was distinguished from other Simons by his *nisba* of ὁ Κυρηναῖος. When St. Luke has occasion later on to write of another man who had the same *nisba*, apparently not taking his information from an Aramaic source or a document translated from Aramaic, he quite expectedly speaks of 'Lucius the Cyrenian.'[3]

It was this 'Lucius of Cyrene' who, as mentioned in the Acts was one of the leaders of the Christian community in Antioch of Syria, who took upon themselves under the guidance of the Holy Spirit the responsibility for the new adventure of sending Barnabas and Saul across the water to the island of Cyprus on the first evangelistic mission. Lucius is also supposed to have come from the same African Cyrene as Simon; but why?[4] In any case, it is but a matter both of tradition and (what is sometimes overlooked!) intrinsic probability; and why should not both Lucius and Simon have come from Kyrenia on the northern coast of Cyprus? It was Lucius who set the train of thought going this last Easter, when there was an invitation to go to Cyprus for helping in the Holy Week and Easter Services in Nicosia *and Kyrenia*. Surely, when the Church leaders in Antioch decided so unmistakenly to make this advance into Cyprus, it must have been due in large measure to the men who already knew something of the local conditions. This is the way in which the missionary enterprise has so often been forwarded; and we should expect that the first move should have been along the same lines. One of the Antiochene Cypriots may have been away for several years, staying with his relatives in Jerusalem, and giving some time to negotiating the sale of his property for the material benefit of the nascent Christian community in Judea. No one has ever yet denied the connexion of Barnabas with Cyprus; his tomb, as they tell you in the island, is just off the main road from Famagusta to Salamis and easily visible from there. Salamis, of course, had a large settlement of Jews—so considerable as to require more than one synagogue.[5] It would have been more striking as guidance if Lucius of Kyrenia had been thinking along the same lines as Barnabas of Salamis over this question of Cypriotic evangelization—still more interesting if Barnabas spoke from the Jewish angle and Lucius from the Gentile, when the prophets and teachers met in Antioch. Surely it is a much more reasonable suggestion to think of this Lucius as having come from nearby Kyrenia, meeting him as we do in Antioch just across the water—on clear days it is possible to see Cyprus from the roofs of Lattakiya—than from 'the parts of Libya about Cyrene.' Why so often

[1] Legge, *ad loc.*

[2] *i.e.*, al Qudsi (= Jerusalemite): an Nabulsi (from Nablus, etc.).

[3] Ac 13^{12}.

[4] *Beginnings of Christianity*, v. 489.

[5] Ac 4^{36} 13^{5}.

does the less likely come to be the predominant theory in Western New Testament scholarship?[1] It is only a tradition after all that Lucius belonged to these African Cyrenaica, the holder of its earliest episcopate. He just slips in and out of the New Testament with this one allusion. Cyrene was an important place—no one denies that—but the argument seems to be that because it was important Lucius came from there. In other words, the lesser known place suffers from having almost the same name as the more important! Simon, of course, takes us back a stage further in Christian history; but might it not be, too, that he came from Cypriot Kyrenia? Why should not he be connected with the lesser-known but geographically nearer place? Incidentally it seems to have been taken for granted that both these men were Jews, though never so stated in the New Testament. And it would seem likely that almost from the first there would have been a Gentile or two among the leaders of the Church in Antioch. It was people from Cyprus and Cyrene, who started preaching to the Greeks at Antioch.[2] Of course Cyrene has generally been taken to mean the African one in the commentaries, just as it must in Ac 2; but even that allusion in Ac 11, if true, need not preclude the possibility that the 'Cyrene' from which both Lucius and Simon hailed was in Cyprus. Thinking about the intrinsic probability of this origin for these two New Testament Christians, it seemed a very remarkable coincidence to open Mr. Rupert Gunnis' new book on *Historic Cyprus* and in the chapter on 'Kyrenia' come upon the following sentences: 'Kyrenia existed long before the Latin occupation, and once was a capital of nine kingdoms into which the island was divided in ancient times. It is said that it was originally founded by Cyrus, King of Persia, when he captured the island. *Simon, who carried our Lord's cross to Calvary, is supposed to have been born in Kyrenia.*'[3] Further inquiry elicited the information that sixteenth and seventeenth century travellers in Cyprus found and recorded the tradition. The question here is as to whether one local legend is as good as another; or whether in this case Kyrenia could be reckoned as scientific a guess as Cyrene, which has held the field for so long unchallenged, as the original home of Simon and so of Lucius.

There have been various spellings of Kyrenia during its history. In 1211 Wilbrandus de Oldenberg relates that he and his fellow travellers first 'touched at *Schernae* (*Keryneia*).' Over two centuries later Pero Tafur says that he left the city of Nicosia and 'went to *Aherines*, where the vessel awaited him that was to take him to Rhodesh' The next traveller from Europe, of whom there is record, Bendetto Bordone, describes '*Cerines* as a mountain a thousand paces in height with a circuit of two miles.' In 1631, when Stochore was in Cyprus, he states that 'on account of the heat we left *Gerines* at night for Nicosia. Nearly forty years later Hurtel mentions 'the town of *Cerines* in Cyprus.' Then in 1683 Van Bruyn says that all that 'remains of *Sarignia* or *Cerines*, anciently called *Ceraunia*, is a harbour for galleys. . . .' Interestingly enough he also states having been shown in Kyrenia a piece of the true Cross! What more likely spot than that from which Cypriot tradition claimed Simon to have sprung? Heyman, in 1709, says that *Cerines* anciently *Ceraunia*, 'is a bishoprick, but the harbour is fit only for small craft.' (He also has a curious misnomer in his claim that the Salamis legend as he heard it with regard to Barnabas declared that it was an Arabic copy of the Gospel of St. Matthew which was found fastened to the saint's neck, when his body was exhumed. Surely 'Aramaic' was meant, a welcome tradition to those who hold an Aramaic origin for the First Gospel.) Kyrenia seems to have been very much on the decline during these centuries, for the next traveller, Pococke, in 1738, mentions 'a ruined port called *Cerines*, which is the ancient *Cerynia*.' He was followed in the next decade by another Englishman, Drummond, who speaks of *Cerinia*, 'which was probably built by Cyrus.' The last allusion over a century ago comes from Kinneir, who in 1814 visited *Cerina*, the ancient *Cerinia*.[4] This old name to which so many of the

[1] There is surely as good a case for the 'Babylon' of 1 P 5^{13} being the Egyptian Bablun, close to old Cairo, as the one farther east or as meaning 'Rome'!

[2] Ac 11^{20}.

[3] P. 127.

[4] These quotations are all from Cobham's *Excerpta Cypria*, 13, 34, 62, 216, 232, 241, 249, 418.

travellers refer fits in very well with the spelling of Diodorus Siculus who writes of Τῆς Κερυνίας,[1] and Smilax of Κερύνειαν.[1]

It is perhaps worth while noting next that the Arabic versions seem fairly consistent in describing the *nisba* of Simon and Lucius as *al Qairawani*, an appellation which hardly describes the inhabitant of Cyrene in the modern Barca. Moreover, there has been serious controversy over this adjective as between Muslim and Christian scholarship. The former claims that *Qairawani* could not be used to describe a person hailing from the city known either side of the first century of the Christian era as 'Cyrene,' for it must belong in all rightness to the city of *Qairawan* farther west. This was founded at the time of the Arab conquest by 'Okba—in A.D. 670. The site is some 112 miles south of Tunis. The city of this name would form its *nisba* in the most ordinary way—by the addition of the doubled 'y,' signifying relationship with the noun to which it is attached. The obvious meaning conveyed to an Arab hearing this adjective would undoubtedly be that the man came from the well-known Qairawan in Tunisia—because for the Arab that has been the only one that counted.

All the Arabic versions of the New Testament are post-Islamic, so that there is one reason for this confusion of issue or misunderstanding. For by the time that Qairawan had come on the scene, the Cyrene farther east was well past its zenith. Can it be that the early scholars who first gave Arab Christians the New Testament in their own tongue went wrong over Qairawan and Cyrene—mixed them up as it were? Or might they as Arabic-speaking have used *Qairawani* as the *nisba* for *Kyrenia*, because they knew it so well as that of Tunisian Qairawan? Or were they following some tradition which it is hard to trace? For if the spelling of *Kyrenia* has not been consistent, neither has consistence been the lot of 'the Cyrenian' so far as Arabic and sometimes Latin is concerned. In a copy of the Gospels printed in Rome in 1591 in alternate lines of Arabic and Latin,[2] though two Latin forms are given for the adjective, Mark and Matthew having *Cyreneus* and Luke *Cyrenensis*, the Arabic *nisba* is different at each occurrence. Mark reads *Qarantani*, Matthew *Quryani* (which looks more like Dr. Torrey's 'farmer'), while Luke has the familiar *Qairawani*. Similarly, in the Syriac-Latin edition of the New Testament published in London in 1580, and edited by Immanuel Tremellius,[3] Simon is described in Mark as *Kurinaiensem*, in Matthew as *Kurinaeum*, and in Luke as *Cyrenaeum*.[4] There is but little more than a decade between the two publications and in each the Lukan version is the more normal. This is once more the case in the Arabic edition of the Gospels compiled by Lagarde in 1864. Luke again is normal; Matthew has *Qairabani*, while Mark has the curious *Qurithyani*. The translators seem to have wanted to avoid the familiar *Qairawani* and then taken the line of least resistance. When we reach Lucius in Acts in the Syriac-Latin the single Greek adjective is expressed in a whole sentence—'qui erat ex *Curini* civitate'?

Was there some kind of doubt in the minds of people in those days; or is it all due to carelessness in translation? This may be so, since the Latin version of Tremellius gives the other occurrences of 'Cyrene' with equal inconsistency, or did they know something about Kyrenia as well as Cyrene from travellers? In Ac 2^{10} there is the usual *Cyrenae* (as we should expect), but in 11^{20} we have '*eis e Cypro & ex Cyrinia*,' an expression having a spelling very close to the way in which Cypriot Kyrenia is spelled to-day, as also to some of the spellings awarded it by the travellers of mediæval days. It almost looks as if the Latin translator in Tremellius meant *Kyrenia and not Cyrene*. In Ac 6^{9} the word once more is more normal—*Cyrenaei*. It may be argued that the phrase in 11^{20}, where in Greek it is the adjective that is used (the only verse where Greek has the place is 2^{10}), by its very nature shuts out 'men of Cyrene' from being 'men of Kyrenia.' Does it not have the mention

[1] From an article on 'Cypriot Place Names' by Professor S. Menarthos (in ΑΘΗΝΗ, xviii. 315) who thinks the original spelling was Κινύρια(-εια) the ν and ρ being later transposed. He also thinks the first syllable should have ε which agrees with most of the travellers mentioned.

[2] *Catalogue of Printed Bibles*, 1636, ed. J. Baptista Raymond.

[3] *C.P.B.*, 8949.

[4] The Syriac has the same form in each Gospel.

of Cyprus in the very same breath? Possibly so; but there are parallel cases to this usage in Luke, where he mentions Judea and Jerusalem in the same breath.[1] There should be no need for this either: still it was done. Jerusalem was long the capital of Judea (sometimes of a wider empire); and Kyrenia, as we have seen, had been capital of the nine kingdoms, into which the island was divided. The difference is that we know about the relationship of Judea and Jerusalem; the little island comes so little into the picture for us; *but it has always meant more in the life and thought of the peoples of the mainland of Syria and Palestine.*

After all, Cyprus can boast a history like so much of the Near East that has its roots at least in the early Bronze Age. More than two millennia later the relationship with the Phœnician cities was very close. The steamer these days that leaves Tripoli makes its next call at Famagusta or Larnaca (Citium), and in the old days the sailing boats merely took longer over the same voyage. It was the Phœnicians, who were responsible for the introduction of Astarte worship into the island.[2] There are relics, too, of the Roman period, which began in 58 B.C., still visible on the sea front at Kyrenia, which had a connecting road with Salamis. With all these facts in mind it is surely no less fantastic, and perhaps much more reasonable, to suggest that Simon who carried our Lord's Cross came from Cypriot Kyrenia than that he should be equated with 'Symeon who was called Niger,'[3] or to write of him as 'the swarthy proselyte from the far-off colony in Northern Africa.'[4]

For the sons of Simeon to have had Greek and Latin names respectively would be no less out of the question in Cyprus than elsewhere; while Rufus' mother could have been a mother to St. Paul, wherever she acted in this capacity, and whether or not she hailed from Cyprus herself, whither he first went in company with two friends, Barnabas and Mark—the first an admitted Cypriot, while his cousin certainly seems to have entertained ideas of his own about the island, returning there with Barnabas after the difference of opinion concerning his behaviour with St. Paul. In *The Hidden Romance of the New Testament* Dr. J. A. Robertson asks why St. Mark inserts the names of Alexander and Rufus 'without further comment'; then answers his query himself with the words: 'Obviously because they were well-known Christians in the community in whose midst Mark wrote his Gospel.'[5] *Why not equally obviously because he had known them for years—personal friends from cousinly Cyprus, able to substantiate the simple facts that he was giving in connexion with the journey to the Cross.*

If Ro 16 was really destined for Ephesus, half the argument that it was the Church of Rome in which the two young men were known falls to the ground. They might have been really equally well known in the valley of the Lycus as on the banks of the Tiber. But is not this a precarious argument in any case? Must they not almost certainly be mentioned not because they were well known in any particular locality, *but as evidential authority in support of a minor incident in the story of the Cross and Passion, for which the first-hand evidence of any one of the original apostles was wanting.* For the equally interesting detail in Gethsemane of the disciples sleeping, the other Simon is mentioned;[6] and over a number of the paragraphs all through Mark, great and small, the name of Peter might be placed, as authority for what follows. In this case there was no apostolic authority citable; and Mark had not even his own; why then go further afield than the desire for authority—what Islamic Tradition calls *isnad*[7]—in searching for a reason for the inclusion in the Gospel narrative of the father of Alexander and Rufus? It is in fact tempting to suggest that really it was for *more than the mere fact that he*

[1] Lk 5^{17} 6^{17}.

[2] The Greeks equated her with Aphrodite, hence the religious importance of Paphos.

[3] Symeon might well have been called Niger, if he had slave blood in him, or was extra dark. Cf. Ash Sha'sani, the mystic, so called because of the 'abundance of his hair (sha'r). *Vide* Margaret Smith in *The Moslem World*, July 1939.

[4] *The Hidden Romance of the New Testament*, 204.

[5] So, too, apparently Turner, Robinson, Rawlinson. Swete is more cautious.

[6] 'He saith unto Peter: 'Simon . . .'

[7] The chain of guarantors certifying a particular tradition—going back to an original companion of Muhammad.

carried the Cross that Simon is mentioned, but rather for most of the material that follows in Mk 15 up to the close of v.[32]. What need can there possibly be to suppose that Simon 'hurried away without waiting for a single word of recognition for his help,' once with his heavy burden he had reached the place of crucifixion? This contingency certainly never occurred to Basilides, or he could hardly have suggested that Simon suffered in the place of Jesus[1]—a theory which some scholars have held to be an origin of the Quranic denial of the Crucifixion.

Though we are glad of it, there would be no more necessity for the Christian world to know the name of the man who carried the Cross than the name of the centurion charged with carrying out the sentence—unless there was a *special reason*. Is not the one here suggested the most reasonable? Even if the pericope circulated separately before St. Mark incorporated it in his Gospel, this reason for the inclusion of the names would be in no case invalidated; whereas if they are only mentioned as those well known in any community, there would be but the barest local significance in the recollection—so bare as to be hardly worth while!

[1] *Vide, e.g.* Rawlinson's *Commentary, ad loc.*

There is one further detail. Mark describes Simon as *παράγοντα*, just 'passing by,' which of course was why the soldiers took advantage of the situation. Then comes the information that he was *ἐρχόμενον ἀπ' ἀγροῦ* the phrase retained by Luke and neglected by Matthew. There is no need for this latter phrase unless explanatory of *παράγοντα*. But if there is anything in the foregoing suggestion might it not be in place to translate the second phrase 'coming from his land'? Simon always remembered that this incident took place on the way home from a visit to his land. If Barnabas of Cyprus had a piece of land in Palestine, why should not Simon of Kyrenia have had one too?[2] The difference was that his was near the city. He would speak in later times of 'my land' just as Peter of 'my house.' Is it not more reasonable to think of Cypriots as having land in Palestine than those in far-off Cyrene? It is only another detail that rounds off the story of the part played by the father of a Cypriot family on the day of the Cross, which was but the start of a greater part played by the sons and mother as time went on in the development of the Christian Church.

[2] Ac 4^{36}. See also Moulton and Milligan, *Vocabulary*, 6, 7.

Ox and Ass before Him Bow.

By the Reverend C. E. Wager, B.A., Little Gaddesden, Berkhamsted.

Men and women in these days come to the story of Christmas with varied emotional responses. *Emotional*, for although our reason may well play its part, its large part, in estimating the moral, or æsthetic values in the narrative, our *feeling* is that mental part of us which makes response, now of tender reminiscence of our own happy childhood, now, perhaps, with a touch of quiet yet accepted loss, or yet again it may even be of exasperation at the long continuance of so large a proportion of ... and inextricably, so it seems, bound up with essential truth. Legends became so interlaced, *entangled* indeed in the groundwork of historical truth, that the work of disentanglement threatens to discourage us by its immensity. That is undoubtedly true of all worth-while work in Christian origins. Our discouragement will be the greater in proportion to our desire to 'save' this or that element of some early Christian narrative. Yet we are by this time well aware that any investigation claiming to be scientific must have one only motive—as accurate approach to truth as is possible. Other quite worthy motives—charity may be one of them—will be duly weighed, and may at times

prevent us from giving out to all and sundry what seems to us inescapable truth—not because we disdain to cast hard-won pearls before swine in a superior intellectualism, but because charity (itself an aspect of 'truth' in deepest sense) demands watchfulness lest babes needing milk be choked by strong meat.

With these preliminaries of cautious boldness, and with a faith that truth will not injure truth, and that 'the truth will set free' those who want and are not afraid of freedom, let us examine the Presence in the narrative of the ox and ass. At once we notice they are *not* 'in the narrative,' and we are well aware how they do not seem to be prominent till much later—early Middle Ages, say. Where do they come from?

Well, we might say they are just good representative domestic animals. They might be symbols of that serviceableness of beast to man that man has won for himself through centuries of civilized living, and here they are bowing down to the representative Man when He first appears on earth—the patient, uncomplaining, greatly useful ox, the readily burdened, steadily plodding Palestinian ass. Moreover, legends grow by gradual accretion, and so we remind ourselves that with their breaths they kept the air in the stable warm for the Divine-human Infant, and kept the first Christian fast by eating no hay lest the manger might be wanting its softness.

Here is legend delightful, and, unless we haven't an ounce of poetry in us, here is some sort of expression of truth. But *this* truth is not that of historical fact, of events happening in some past time, and some other place than where we are now; it is truth within ourselves, and truth concerning ourselves, which struggles in all of us for expression, and yet cannot find accurate, mathematical, logical expression, but only by the poetry of legend. It is that ounce of poetry in us all that gladly lights upon these charming childlike fantasies, because they satisfy and appease that inner unsatisfied truth within that stimulates and almost irritates the soul into attempted expression, yet succeeds in so few of us. How successful the Christmas story is in its entirety, yet how difficult to disentangle the poetic from the historic truth. And, if fantasy is mistaken for fact, and treated as such, we are in danger of exchanging the wholesome life-giving Bread of real religion, for a harmful, disintegrating (and so 'unwholesome') life-destroying neurosis.

(Someone has said 'Religion is a successful neurosis.' Clever enough, but—'successful in *what*?') So, with this poetic kind of truth well in mind, let us welcome a further inquiry of reason into the origin of 'Ox and Ass before Him bow.' The matter is really quite simple. In the Psalm, of unknown date and origin, attached to the Book of Habakkuk we read (Hab 3^2) 'O Lord revive thy work *in the midst of the years*.' That is a good translation of the Hebrew text. But the Greek of the Septuagint (translated into English) is '*in the midst of two animals* Thou shalt be known, when the years draw nigh Thou shalt be recognized.' If we put side by side the unpointed Hebrew, and the Greek text we see, and see with that somewhat amused surprise that counts among the minor joys of life, for the student at any rate, that the Greek translator has made a delightful mistake. The Hebrew consonants for the number 2 are the same as those for 'years.' Similarly, the Hebrew verb for re-vive ('make *to live*') is almost the same as the word for 'animals' ('*living* creatures'). The Septuagint became the recognized Old Testament for Greek-speaking Christians (and in consequence fell into disfavour in orthodox Judaism) and proved valuable in ways that are quite foreign to our modern ways of thought. Christians learnt from Jews the trick of 'proving' a well-loved truth by quoting an appropriate text from Holy Writ. But 'trick' is too harsh a word; it imports into an entirely non-critical, miracle-loving and therefore miracle-expecting (and therefore miracle-finding!) type of mind, too much of our modern scientific temper. We can see the process easily at work in the writer of the 'Gospel according to St. Matthew.' He 'proves' the Virgin Birth by reference to the well-known text in Isaiah; he even 'proves' the divine necessity of the Return of the Holy Family from Egypt by a verse from Hosea (who was speaking not of an individual but of the Exodus). If we agree with scholars that the date of this Gospel in its present form is something after A.D. 80, we see what ample time that gives, not only

for such argumentative use of proof texts—a use still not wholly dead !—but for the growth of legend within the Gospel narrative, a growth naïve and happy but inevitably disqualifying the narrative from a claim to rigid historical accuracy. Indeed, the writer as he collected and selected his tales probably had edification rather than accuracy in his intention.

Has that bit of straightforward Biblical criticism destroyed 'Christmas' for us? No. The truth which produced the legend is that kind of truth which cannot be expressed except by way of poetry, drama, legend. If we try expression by sheer logic, reason, mathematics, we shall fail. That sort of medium breaks and spoils the truth. 'Christmas' needs just the Christmas atmosphere for its functioning. We feel it rather than think it. But some of us sometimes wish it were not so, wish for 'fact,' intelligible, clearly stated, historical fact, miraculous fact which will by its utter miraculousness prove something, and prove it to our reasoning consciousness, about God, Jesus, and ourselves. And Jesus, if we try to get as close as possible to the real Jesus, refused to satisfy any such demand. Even if He could have satisfied it, we can be sure He would not. It 'wasn't like Him to do that sort of thing,' we might fairly say, because we *feel* that is true about Him. There remains—Himself, and what men and women made of Him and learned from Him and found in Him and got from Him and (so) gave of themselves because of Him. That 'feeling about Jesus' went on; it was effective and dynamic, and still is. No doubt it needed and found legendary and poetic expression, but the effectiveness of Jesus—of Christmas—is seen very much at work in the hopes and strivings of men for the best that is *in* man, and that 'best' is so much better than the merely good, than the placidly pious. If man could only grasp (we feel), could see and feel and so live out fully the meaning of Christmas! And what is that? Here in the Babe and in what He grew to be, here is what we mean by that mysterious word 'God,' that word which conceals in the unknown vastly more than it reveals in the known, here is that God then as visible as He can be to man, visible in a practical way and for practical purposes.

But how prosaic—indeed how prosy we have become. Let us slip again into that more diffused light of legend. See how Thomas Hardy is in the true line of our legend 'Ox and Ass before Him bow' in his poem of 'The Oxen.'

Christmas Eve, and twelve of the clock.
'Now they are all on their knees,'
An elder said as we sat in a flock
By the embers in hearthside ease.

We pictured the meek mild creatures where
They dwelt in their strawy pen,
Nor did it occur to one of us there
To doubt they were kneeling then.

So fair a fancy few would weave
In these years! Yet, I feel,
If someone said on Christmas Eve,
'Come; see the oxen kneel

'In the lonely barton by yonder coomb
Our childhood used to know,'
I should go with him in the gloom,
Hoping it might be so.

Contributions and Comments.

'Thou sayest.'

In the course of an investigation into possible examples of questions mistakenly read as statements (such as Dom Clements has mentioned in Mt 25^{26}), a perusal of Mr. Gardner-Smith's *St. John and the Synoptic Gospels* has directed my thought to Mk 15^{2} and its parallels. (1) Is there any sound extra-canonical authority for making this a form of statement evading a direct *yes* or *no*. (2) If understood as 'Is it you who say this?' Jn 18^{34} is a fuller record which explains it. (3) Pilate's question is better understood as a slighting sneer, 'You are the King of the Jews, are you?'

T. Nicklin.

Ringwood, Hants.

Ezekiel xxviii. 12:

אַתָּה חוֹתֵם תָּכְנִית
מָלֵא חָכְמָה וּכְלִיל יֹפִי

THE word תָּכְנִית is a long-standing *crux interpretum*, and various emendations have already been proposed. Professor G. A. Cooke has suggested (*Old Testament Essays*, 41) that we should read לְתַכְלִית, 'thou wast wise *to perfection*,' but it is doubtful whether this is really Hebrew.

I venture to submit that all difficulty is removed if we but vocalize תַּכְנִית and derive the word from the root כנה (after the pattern of תַּבְנִית from בנה, or תַּכְלִית from כלה, etc.). The meaning will then be:

> O thou that signest thyself *with the title*:
> Full of wisdom and perfect in beauty. . . .

THEODOR H. GASTER.

London.

Judas Iscariot in the Fourth Gospel.

THE work of Professors C. H. Dodd and R. H. Lightfoot has accustomed us to look for 'realized eschatology' in the Fourth Gospel. They have shown how much the author was concerned to combat the tendency to interpret and colour our Lord's teaching with reference to a commonly-expected Second Coming in the near future. To St. John the Apocalypse was not something in the future; it was already realized. The Armageddon between the eternal forces of good and evil had already been accomplished through the incarnate life and passion of the Son of God. Right had prevailed by the Cross, so that the Kingdom of God and eternal life could at once be man's inheritance.

Realization of this seems to offer a guide to interpreting St. John's treatment of Judas Iscariot. It has often been remarked how unfair the Fourth Gospel is to Judas in its constant insistence on his villainy. May not the reason be that, just as Jesus was eternal Goodness incarnate, so to St. John Judas represented in human form the eternal forces of evil opposing Him? This would explain a curious phrase applied to Judas in Jn 17^{12}. There he is referred to as ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας (the son of perdition). The phrase may have been suggested by the verb ἀπώλετο; but exactly the same expression is used by St. Paul in 2 Th 2^{3}, an apocalyptic passage, where it refers clearly to the Antichrist who must be revealed before the end. 'For the end will not be,' writes St. Paul, 'except the falling away come first and the man of sin be revealed, ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας, he that opposeth and exalteth himself against all that is called God.' Similarly in the Evangelium Nicodemi 20 exactly the same phrase is used in reference to Satan. Never, except this once in the Fourth Gospel, is it used of a man; and may not the implication be that to St. John's mind the supernatural 'son of perdition' was not to be expected in the future, but had already appeared and had been incarnate in Judas Iscariot?

It is noticeable that our Lord is represented as speaking of the fate of Judas as already past (ἀπώλετο—past tense), presumably because as the Evil One incarnate he could never be redeemed. This is in accord with St. John's first reference to Judas in 6^{64} where Jesus is said to know from the beginning (ἐξ ἀρχῆς) who should betray Him. ἐξ ἀρχῆς is usually interpreted as 'from the moment that Jesus began to observe his disciples' characters.' But ἀπ' ἀρχῆς would be the more natural phrase in this sense. ἐξ ἀρχῆς is used in the Septuagint of Is 40^{21}, 41^{26}, and always seems to have the meaning 'from the beginning of things.' It may have its usual sense in Jn 6^{64} if John meant to imply that Eternal Good knew from the beginning of time the methods that Eternal Evil would use against Him. Even more clear is Jn 6^{70}, where Judas is openly called διάβολος. St. John also goes out of his way to stress the fact that Judas throughout our Lord's ministry was a robber (12^{4}) and unclean (13^{11}); and the emphatic use of ἐκεῖνον in 13^{27} seems to indicate the alien mind of Judas.

Throughout St. John's account of the Last Supper Judas is paid special honour by our Lord. He seems to have been reclining on the left of the Master (the place of honour), since our Lord was able to speak to him privately without the conversation being overheard; and it was, of course, a token of great intimacy to let a guest dip his bread in the τρύβλιον. The point of all this seems to be to stress how unnaturally evil the subsequent conduct of Judas was. There was no response from his better nature because he, the son of perdition, had no better nature. So he goes out to do the devil's work into the inky darkness of night. The dramatic phrase ἦν δὲ νύξ is surely a peep into the black soul of Judas, and an indication that the Evil One needs blackness to carry out his work. In writing it, St. John must have recollected how our Lord had called Himself 'the Light of the World'; and he points the contrast.

In the description of the arrest in Gethsemane the falling-back of Judas's party is significant (Jn 18[6]). There is, of course, no hint in the Synoptists of any hesitancy on their part. But St. John, who insists that Judas was standing by (v.[5]), tells us that in answer to their first question our Lord responds simply εἰμί, the name of God, I AM; and they all fall backward to the ground (ἀπῆλθαν εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω καὶ ἔπεσαν χαμαί). If the son of perdition was incarnate in Judas, the reason for this shrinking would be that the powers of evil could not stand up against the majesty of the name of God, until Jesus voluntarily submits Himself to them.

The evidence is not, of course, conclusive. But it does seem that 'realized eschatology' helps to clarify certain features in St. John's references to Judas, which are otherwise puzzling and obscure.

J. S. Billings.

Solihull, Warwickshire.

The Date of the Epistle to the Galatians.

The date of Galatians is one of the acute problems of New Testament criticism. If the Epistle is dated before the Council of Jerusalem of Ac 15, it must precede the Thessalonian Epistles, and its greater kinship with Corinthians and Romans, which are later than Thessalonians, has to be accounted for: if after the Council, we encounter the difficulty of harmonizing Paul's own account of his visits to Jerusalem with that in Acts.

I. Duncan accepts the earlier date, and suggests that the pronounced eschatology of Thessalonians emerges only when Paul feels that the time of the End is at hand. This, though an interesting theory, does not attempt an explanation of the very real stylistic difficulties, and does not account for the speedy slackening of the eschatological emphasis after the Thessalonian letters.

II. The difficulties inherent in the acceptance of the later date arise from the fact, that while Acts mentions three visits to Jerusalem up to and including the Council-visit, in Ac 9^{26} 11^{27-30} with 12^{25} and 15 (Acts A, B, and C), Paul only mentions two, in Gal 1^{18} and 2^{1} (Galatians A and B). Various solutions have been suggested:

(i) All theories accept the equation: Acts A = Galatians A.

(ii) That Acts B = Galatians B is the solution accepted by those who date the Epistle early.

(iii) That Acts C = Galatians B is only possible if the differences between the accounts are ignored or explained away, and if it is supposed, with Lightfoot, that Paul omitted to mention Acts B, or with Burton, that Acts B is inaccurate. Neither of these suppositions is easily tenable.

(iv) That Acts B = Acts C = Galatians B again reflects on the trustworthiness of Acts. Lake, for example, takes Acts B and C as doublet accounts, from different sources, of the same event.

According to these solutions, it would seem that we are compelled either to accept the early date, or to impugn either the veracity of Paul or the authenticity of the Acts passages. But is this really the choice?

That Acts B = Galatians B is the solution accepted by those who date the Epistle early; but can it only be accepted by them? Is it not possible that Paul, writing after the Jerusalem Council, begins the record of his visits to Jerusalem *and never finishes it*? In other words, that he omits one visit, but the omitted visit is the third and not the second?

The arguments against the suggestion that Paul omits to mention a visit are:

(i) That he is bound to mention all visits, to show that he had no opportunity to derive his doctrine from men, and that his claim to divine authority is true. Now at the Council of Ac 15 Paul's doctrine was ratified, with especial reference to the Judaistic point at issue. No one could have supposed that *there* Paul was taught a doctrine which he afterwards misinterpreted, nor have quoted *that* visit against him.

(ii) That Paul 'swears before God' that his account is true. But on this theory, so it is, *so far as it goes*: and there need be neither *suppressio veri* nor *suggestio falsi* in his leaving the account incomplete.

The only remaining argument against a date later than the Council is that Paul does not quote the Council's decision to support his argument. Here it has been suggested that he is showing his lack of complete agreement with the Council's findings as a whole. But perhaps even more likely, since the Galatians had obviously disregarded the findings of the Council in any case, is the suggestion

that Paul, having proved his independent authority, goes on to argue the case from first principles: and in support of this suggestion it may be pointed out that Paul, after his account of his first two visits and of his rebuke to Peter, bursts out without any pause into his passionate appeal—so vehemently, indeed, that it is difficult to distinguish clearly where rebuke ends and appeal begins. The Council's decisions, which have not produced the desired effect, are brushed aside in the heat of the moment, and the unfinished tale of events, once interrupted, is never resumed.

L. G. Buckingham.

Richmond College, Surrey

Entre Nous.

Saints of Humanity.

In 1898 Dr. Edwin W. Smith spent a year as the guest and pupil of the French Evangelical Missionaries at Morija in Basutoland. Forty-one years later he finished his biography of Adolphe and Adèle Mabille, and the volume has now been published by Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton (10s. 6d. net). In 1898 Adolphe Mabille had already been dead for four years, but his all-pervading influence was still there; the institutions that he had founded were flourishing; his translations of the Scriptures and of religious literature were in constant use; his hymns were still sung. Mrs. Mabille was still taking an active part in the missionary work, and Dr. Smith was deeply impressed by her personality. In telling the story of *The Mabilles of Basutoland* and the conditions under which they lived, Dr. Smith has also written the political history of Basutoland. Its founder was the great Moshesh. He it was who conceived the idea of confederating the many scattered tribes. He made his capital in Thaba Bosiu. Its natural position made it almost impregnable and Moshesh fortified it strongly. He beat off attacks by the Zulus, by the Matebele, and others. Of the latter campaign it is told that, 'when after a fruitless effort they were retreating, messengers driving fat cattle overtook them. "Moshesh salutes you!" was the message; "supposing that hunger has brought you to this country he sends you these oxen that you may eat on your way home." "We will never attack him again," the Matebele said, and they kept their word.'

'That is the kind of man Moshesh was. Chaka used to say: "To govern men you must kill them." Moshesh used to say: "I am Moshesh and my sister is named Peace." If fighting were forced upon him he would fight right valiantly; but if a peaceful way out could be found he was always ready to take it.'

When in 1833 the first three French missionaries reached Basutoland they were warmly welcomed by Moshesh. They were Thomas Arbousset Constant Gosselin, and Eugène Casalis. Twenty-six years after, Casalis was succeeded by Adolphe Mabille who had married his eldest daughter, Adèle. She could turn her hand to anything, and of her husband she wrote, 'Adolphe is also trying all sorts of handicrafts, and he does not do them badly. In turn he is preacher, printer, translator, mason, shoemaker, carpenter, etc. Happily other missionaries can do all these things equally well, otherwise we might become over-proud of our talents.'

Mabille laboured and prayed for conversion and regeneration. 'Whatever may have been the inclination of some of his colleagues, past and present, towards a "church of multitude," for him it had no meaning. He demanded conversion. Unless a man or woman accepted the faith wholeheartedly and proved acceptance by consistent living, Mabille refused to open the door of the church to him or her.' Not a numerous church but a pure and zealous one was his ideal. 'Did any show zeal: he asked whether outward manifestations of zeal were not taking the place of a growth in soul. Did they carefully abstain from pagan practices: he asked whether it was for pure love for Christ, or through fear of ex-communication. No man more welcomed a spirit of fervour or rejoiced more over an assembly of enthusiastic believers. But he measured progress by growth in brotherhood and, in his elders, by evidence of compassion rather than rigour in dealing with erring members.'

Towards the end of his life Moshesh was converted. 'After our return to Morija,' Mrs. Mabille writes, 'some time went by without any news of Moshesh. At last one afternoon an express message from Mr. Jousse asked your father and Uncle Eugène [Casalis] to go immediately to Thaba Bosiu. After they had exchanged greetings with the Chief he said to your father: "Tell me

the age of the little child which your wife had in her arms when she came last time." "Three months," replied your father. "Then he is the same age as myself," said Moshesh. "When you told me of the birth of that child I also was coming to birth. It is only now that I am beginning to be a man." He asked your father if he could certify that what the missionaries had taught him was the truth. "Yes," your father answered, "I have that certitude myself; I know it is the truth." "That is all right," said Moshesh, "I believe so too".'

Dr. Smith has been particularly successful in his picture of Adolphe Mabille, a man of prayer and of works. '"What funny people they are," he remarked one day of certain folk who, after making an effort, talked about repose, "*sont-ils drôles*: they think that to be tired is a reason for not working!" He himself laboured incessantly and found rest only in a change of occupation. . . . Yet amid all this laboriousness certain hours of every day were dedicated to prayer and quiet meditation. He rose early so that the first fresh hour might be spent alone with God. . . . It was their regular custom to retire to their room immediately after the midday meal, not for a siesta, but for prayer together.'

Adèle Mabille wrote down her memories for her children and grandchildren. From these Dr. Smith has been able to get that wealth of detail that makes the biography alive. We have no hesitation in saying that this volume—packed with matter—is not only outstanding amongst missionary biographies but will also prove an invaluable contribution to the political history of that part of the British Empire known as Basutoland.

Stanley Jones.

Stanley Jones never fails in his writings to interest, to stimulate and, at times, to provoke. His latest book, *Along the Indian Road* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net), he speaks of as a sequel to 'The Christ of the Indian Road,' written fourteen years ago. It is, we venture to say, the finest book he has written. It is largely autobiographical and like his former book abounds in striking incidents connected with his round-table conferences in India. These conferences may be apt to give an altogether too favourable view of India's attitude to Christ, but the writer recognizes that much of it is lip-service. 'You can raise an Indian audience off its seat in appreciation and applause, and then when you ask them whether they will do something about it they will reply, "Oh no, but it's all very lovely and we will hear you again."' It should also be noted that his contacts are practically all with Hindus and that the Muhammadan problem is hardly touched. One of the most interesting chapters deals with the character and views of Mahatma Gandhi, for whom Stanley Jones has a profound but not indiscriminate admiration. He believes that by his non-co-operation movement Gandhi has given to the world the moral substitute for war. He lets it appear, however, that the British authorities have treated the non-co-operators with great consideration. 'We can thank our lucky stars,' said one of them, 'that we are fighting the British and not some other nation, for the British have something in the inside of them to appeal to.' The question may fairly be raised how they would fare if they had to deal with the German Gestapo or the Russian GPU, or what would become of them if left to the mercy of the fighting races of the North-West. There are admissions that the use of force cannot yet be dispensed with. Mr. Jones speaks of communal riots—'riots which would set India ablaze were they not put down,' while Gandhi says, 'We have frequently to depend on the police and sometimes even the military.'

An important chapter, entitled 'Clogged Channels,' deals with the handicap of a divided Church, and Mr. Jones, while firmly repudiating a mechanical union, strongly affirms spiritual unity and outlines a scheme for what he calls a 'Branch Unity Plan.' In this connexion he launches a formidable attack on the Madras Conference for putting the Church in the foreground instead of Christ and the Kingdom of God.

One admirable feature in his work is the frankness with which he declares himself an evangelist, out to convert men to Christ. In this he differs from some others who in seeking brotherly fellowship with Hindus tend to keep distinctively Christian truth in the background. The question was asked the other day regarding a distinguished missionary, 'Does he maintain the finality of Jesus?'; and the answer given was, 'That depends on how many yards he is away from Rabindranath Tagore'! No such criticism could be made of Stanley Jones who is first and last an evangelist. Let high ecclesiastics note that he regards as one of the most merciful escapes of his life the day when he was elected but declined to be a bishop! Whatever may be thought of some of his interpretations of Christ's teaching and of its application in political and economic spheres, this is emphatically a book to be read and pondered in all the churches.

Belief.

'To hold that all religions are the same is to practise mental abdication. This is not mental liberality; it is nonsense—and unscientific. Science does not wave its hand over all theories and say they are equally good and equally valid. . . . "What is the object of these lectures? What are you trying to do? Convert us?" asked a Hindu at question time. "Of course I am," I replied, "what do you think I am here for if not to convert you? But I am convertible, and if you have something better than I have, I am a candidate for conversion." They laughed and we were friends. They expected me to apologize, but respected me when I did not. "Thank God for somebody who believes something," said a Columbia University student as he came away from a meeting. He was tired of sitting on the horns of a dilemma, and was grateful for someone who dared to choose.' [1]

An Evangelist.

'"Why is he so happy?" asked a Hindu fellow-pilgrim on the Indian road. "What diet does he take?" "I'll tell you why I am so happy and what diet I take: I'm happy because I'm on the Indian road and happier because I bear Good News within my heart, and cannot help but speak of what I've seen and heard. I'm an evangelist. My diet is the will of God—when I feed on that I live. That's why I'm so happy."' [2]

Confidence in God.

'Not infrequently I meet in these days an attitude of mind which has in it, I suspect, some such "irreligious solicitude for God." People talk as though we are saddled with the dreadful responsibility of looking after the concerns of a God who is not too capable of looking after them Himself. Surely the right emphasis is that God looks after our concerns, rather than that we look after His! No doubt this right emphasis can be made in a wrong way. It does not in the least imply, though it can be all too easily taken to imply, that we can sit still and leave everything to God. I am sure that the service of man counts in the achievemen of God's purpose. I am sure it is in some way indispensable. But it is not in the least degree adequate, and therefore its defeats and setbacks are not the irremediable tragedy we sometimes are tempted to take them to be.

There is paradox here, as there always is in the deep things of God's relationship with man and His world. Yet it is paradox which burdens thought only. In the life of faith and obedience it is hardly felt. We must work, as the hymn says, as if on that alone hung the issue of the day, yet we can only work effectively if we preserve a quiet confidence in God, a quiet confidence, that is to say, that on our efforts the issue of the day hardly depends at all, but upon Him.' [3]

Richmondhill Sermons.

Simultaneously there has been published by Hodder & Stoughton a volume of sermons by Dr. J. D. Jones and one by Dr. Short, his successor at Richmondhill Congregational Church, Bournemouth. Dr. Jones has chosen nineteen sermons that he preached there on great festival days. The title of the volume and its message is *Keep Festival* (7s. 6d. net), for so the people will be reminded of the great facts that lie at the heart of the Christian faith. He gives some astonishing instances of complete disregard of Church festivals. 'I heard of a service on a recent Easter Sunday on which there was no reference to the Resurrection either in hymn, or prayer, or sermon. I myself attended a service on Whit Sunday in which there was no mention of the Holy Spirit either in hymn, lesson, prayer, or Sermon.'

Dr. Jones has published many volumes of sermons and this one does not need our commendation.

All Things are Yours (6s. net) is Dr. Short's first volume and so he rightly shows us where he stands. 'I hold fast to a theology of redemption as the sole, satisfying theology. By a theology of redemption I include the need for the redemption of society as well as of the individual. A radical change is called for everywhere. Only God in Christ is adequate to the situation in which we live.' The volume falls into three parts, a series of studies on the Beatitudes, the Ways to the Kingdom, and All Things are Yours. By his sermon in the November number Dr. Short, if this was necessary, was introduced to the readers of this magazine. One of the Beatitude studies is given in abridged form this month and one of Dr. Jones' Christmas sermons is chosen for that day.

[1] E. Stanley Jones, *Along the Indian Road*, 124.
[2] *Ibid.*, 244.
[3] H. H. Farmer in *The Christian World*, Nov. 9.

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.